NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW

No. DLXXVI.

NOVEMBER, 1904.

THE YELLOW PERIL IS THE GOLDEN OPPORTUNITY FOR JAPAN.

BY HIS EXCELLENCY, BARON KENTARO KANEKO, LL.D., OF THE HOUSE OF PEERS OF JAPAN.

WHY the special mission of Prince Iwakura to the European and American governments, in 1872, failed in its attempt to revise our extra-territorial treaty was a mystery to the Japanese people. Why our promulgation of the codes of civil, criminal and commercial laws, with the organizations of the courts and of their procedures, in accordance with Western principles of Christian nations, proved to be of no avail for the abolition of consular jurisdiction in Japan, was again a perplexing mystery to Japanese jurists. And why, for twenty-five years, some of the European governments so persistently waved aside the rightful appeals made to them by Japanese diplomats for the restoration of the autonomy of the Japanese Empire, was not merely a mystery, but a heart-rending mystery, to the statesmen of Japan.

But this mystery was casually explained to me in the year 1892, when I attended the meeting of the Institute of International Law at Geneva, with the special purpose of discussing the report of a committee, to which the Institute had intrusted the task of investigating the condition of Oriental nations with a view to abolishing extra-territorial treaties in the East. On my home-

Copyright, 1904, by THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW PUBLISHING COMPANY. All Rights Reserved

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ward journey, I met in Paris one of the most famous European publicists, who, in the course of our conversations said, substantially in these words: "However closely your codes may approximate to those of Europe, the Western Powers will hesitate to consent to the abolition of the extra-territorial treaties with Japan. They withhold that consent because they fear that, should they return to Japan the full exercise of national independence, she will become great and powerful in the East—a contingency which, they believe, would only arise at the expense and to the menace of their own interests in Asia. It is, therefore, their policy to subject Japan to their oppressive yoke as long as possible."

Words like these seemed to sound the death knell of all our aspirations. For a quarter of a century Japan had, at enormous cost—even at the sacrifice of her priceless traditions—been striving to assimilate her laws and institutions to those of the Western world, with no other object than that of restoring her national autonomy. Yet these utterances of the eminent publicist convinced us that the argument from justice, morality, and humanity had no weight with the European diplomats to the furtherance of our rightful demands. Disappointed, but not discouraged—shocked, but without a murmur—we calmly submitted to our fate! At least, this chilling admonition had given us the secret key to the long-sealed casket of European diplomacy in Asia. In the region of world-diplomacy, where reason fails, there is but one course left. That course Japan was compelled and determined to follow by devoting herself to the completion of her compulsory education system, to the fostering of her industry and commerce, and to the reorganization of her army and navy by modern scientific methods. At last came the event in consequence of which Japan was no longer compelled to beg for a revision of the extra-territorial treaty, but could force upon the Western nations a recognition of her competence to abolish that treaty. After our victory in the China-Japan war of 1894-5 the Western nations discovered in us a Power which they could no longer suppress by keeping us ostracized as a semi-independent nation; they at once changed their attitude, and admitted us to membership in the family of civilized nations.

Having thus, by one victorious campaign against our mighty neighbor, China, restored our national independence; having definitely taken our place in the rank and file of the civilized

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Powers of the world, we continued along the peaceful path which we had marked out for our diplomacy, by cultivating the most cordial relations with the nations of Europe and America—relations which remained untroubled by the slightest cloud until the outbreak of the Russo-Japanese war in February last. It was only after Japan had shown herself in the present struggle to be a match for the most formidable military power in Europe, it was only after she had drawn the bewildered attention of the whole world to her military and naval equipment, her extraordinary successes on land and sea, that we heard again the cry of "Yellow Peril."

What does this epithet mean, when calmly examined? Does it indicate a danger really existing? We may throw light on this question by recalling analogous phrases aimed at other nationalities; of these, one example will suffice. Not many years ago, the cry of "American Peril" was raised. For, when it was found that the United States, with her enormous resources and the wonderful energy of her people, was fast taking a rank among the world Powers, Europeans, scenting peril from America, raised a cry of alarm that echoed even in our country. They even went so far as to plan a "European Alliance," the object of which was to shut out American manufactured goods from the continents of the Old World. Just so, at the present juncture of our war with Russia, certain European politicians have thought fit, assuming a similarly uncharitable attitude towards Japan, to overwhelm her with an undeserved reproach, at the moment when she is forced into a struggle for her existence.

But of what nature is this alleged danger from the "yellow races"? Those who raise the cry tell us that, if Japan wins in this conflict, she will become supreme in the East, will thereupon unite all the Oriental peoples, and will proceed to drive out all Europeans and Americans from the continent of Asia. We are further assured that, when Japan is thus dominant, freedom, even civilization itself, will take flight from the Orient; the dire outcome of Japanese ascendency will be a policy of "Asia for the Asiatics." Such a policy, we may remark, would in one respect be not unnatural; it would be based on feelings which are instinctive in every people. Is not the "Monroe Doctrine" itself, which has played so important a rôle in the development of the United States, founded on the principle of "America for the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Americans"? And what, during the past forty years, has united the Italian people and enabled Italy to take rank as a member of the family of nations, if not the policy of "Italy for the Italians," as carried out under Victor Emmanuel?

As individual right to ownership in land is recognized, so, in the realm of politics, regard is paid to the territorial rights of nations. Now Asiatics have enjoyed, from time immemorial, the possession of the soil of Asia; their right to its territory has never been disputed. Why, then, should they not assert the principle of "Asia for the Asiatics"? Without territorial rights, the sense of national independence is impossible. This possession gone, no form of casuistry can help the Oriental peoples to hold their own against the aggressive competition of the Occidental Powers; we must have, to the full, the sense of national independence which is founded on the universal recognition of territorial rights.

"Blessed are the meek," is one of the precepts of the Christian faith, "for they shall inherit the earth!" For many years the missionaries have taught this precept to the Asiatics; but it has never been practised by the so-called Christian Powers in their dealings with Oriental nations. Indeed, the direct contrary has been the fact; for, many a time during the past fifty years, it has been shown that a nation's surest step to its "disinheritance" of the earth is to be meek and to remain meek. That a cry should arise in the East demanding "Asia for the Asiatics" is thus a natural outcome of the policy which the Christian Powers have pursued in that part of the world. Most of the Oriental nations, to be sure, lack the strength which is needed for successful resistance to the process of territorial "disinheritance." Consider the encroachment of the French in Tongking; the occupation of Kiao-Chao by the Germans; the aggressive movement of Russia in Manchuria—for these are the most striking examples of the "disinheritance" by which China has been despoiled. Only Japan, of all the Eastern nations, has thus far been able to maintain her independence, against continual foreign aggression. If there is a peril in the East, it is not the "Yellow Peril," but the "White Peril"; the former being a mere myth, while the latter is an actual reality.

Does it follow, however, that, should Japan be victorious in the present struggle and become supreme in the East, she will proceed to exclude Europeans and Americans from Oriental coun-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tries? The facts all point the other way. Instead of trying to shut Americans and Europeans out, Japan so far has done all in her power to attract them to the East. Consider what happened after the war with China in 1894-5. Japan then had China at her mercy, and was able at Shimonoseki to dictate to that Power any terms she cared to impose. But what did she actually do? Instead of seeking her own interests to the neglect of the other Powers, Japan seized the opportunity to promote the policy of the "open door" by providing for the abolition of the *likin* system—the system, which so long prevailed in China, of levying duties on imported goods as they crossed the frontiers of the different provinces on their way to the interior. Japan made another contribution to international welfare at that time by causing China to open four ports to the commerce of the world—the ports of Chung-Kiang, Shasi, Kow-Choo, and Soochoo. Last, but not least, she induced China to grant foreigners the right to establish industrial factories in China. All these concessions had been sought by Western diplomats for many years at Peking, but such efforts proved unavailing, until independent action was taken by Japan at the signing of the Shimonoseki Treaty in 1895. Is it not plain that, if the Japanese had entertained the slightest desire to drive Americans and Europeans from the continent of Asia, they would have made an altogether different treaty with China from the one they made—would, in a word, have sought to secure exclusive advantages for themselves? Instead, the diplomats of Japan devoted themselves sincerely to the task of opening China to the whole world. Even after the return of Wei-hai-wei to China, we made no protest against the occupation of that strategical harbor by the English.

This broader view of Japan's responsibilities as a world Power has appeared in other connections as well. The story was circulated, for instance, during the Spanish-American war, that Japan was secretly assisting the Filipinos, by sending ammunition, and even soldiers, to the aid of Aguinaldo. But the rumor was afterward proved to be false. Not only was Japan not assisting Aguinaldo and the Filipinos, but she was actually giving moral support to the United States in its plans for the occupation of the Philippine Islands, since she considered that the occupation of the islands by the American Republic was the only way to maintain peace among the Filipinos. One might readily multiply such ex-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

amples to show to our friends that Japan never entertained the idea of closing the Asiatic continent against Europeans and Americans. From the beginning of our intercourse with the Western Powers, we have earnestly tried to introduce Western civilization into the Far East, and have consistenly promoted that civilization in the interests of universal peace.

When the cry of "Yellow Peril" began to be heard, we were aroused to a study of the subject, and its international effects. After the opening of our first parliament in 1890, the attitude of the Western Powers towards Japan underwent a change. We felt that Europe and America were kindly patronizing us, simply patting us on the back. It seemed to us as if our Western friends were saying: "Yes, you have done wonders. You have introduced constitutional government and adopted Western civilization. In the last fifteen years, you have made simply prodigious strides. You are, indeed, a most promising nation!" But there came a further change. When our war with China in 1894-5 ensued, and we showed our superiority to China in that struggle, the Western Powers no longer attempted to pat us on the back. They began to treat Japan with respect, for they recognized in her a naval and a military strength which they had never before suspected.

When we studied the international relations of modern Powers to each other, we found that a country like Belgium or Denmark receives from England the same consideration as Germany in all her diplomatic dealings; that Switzerland is treated by France with the same regard as the United States; and that the respect which is shown to such countries is an acknowledged international right. But a further question is: Do these smaller nations enjoy that deeper respect which is founded on fear? Can they command the esteem which is everywhere paid to their more powerful neighbors, such as Germany, France or England? The answer is obvious. In the realm of diplomacy, the nations treat each other with equal deference, making no distinction on the basis of territory or strength of armament. Yet, since, in the event of international ruptures, there is no other way to settle them than the appeal to arms, a nation, in order to maintain her independent position in the midst of international rivalries, must command sources of power which will inspire other nations, not simply with respect, but with fear. This fear is an evidence of such power in the nation feared, and that power, further, may justly or unjustly be

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

regarded as a potential peril. Therefore, the cry of "Yellow Peril" is a recognition by the Western nations that Japan has at last attained her long-sought-for rank among the great Powers.

But logic falters when power of such sort is supposed to engender inevitable peril. We are profoundly convinced that the possession of an ample war equipment is necessary (temporarily, at least) if nations are to reap the benefits of our complex modern civilization, provided always that their military and naval forces are not used in the pursuit of selfish ends, for the purposes of aggressive ambition. We recognize a close relation between readiness for war, which on the surface is fraught with menace, and the assured peace which powerful armaments never fail to promote and maintain. History furnishes evidence for the generalization that, the stronger a nation's army and navy, the greater is its certainty of peace—a view expressed at the Peace Conference at The Hague by an eminent English delegate who had come to take part in that movement for the abolition of war. Japan herself has a motto, dating from the earliest time in the life of her people, which runs: "Never forget the arts of war, even in the time of peace!" Nor can Japan afford to forget "the arts of war"; for, while she is, in a geographical sense, situated very advantageously in the world of commerce, the advantage carries with it the constant menace of enforced contact with the most powerful nations on the face of the globe. Consequently, while Japan truly has at heart the interests of peace, her very position in the East compels her to guard peace, for herself and for others, with an efficient army and navy.

Some may ask: What are the national aspirations of Japan? Our aim, as shown by the whole course of our modern history, is to introduce to the distant and long-neglected East the blessings of Western civilization. For a task of this kind, Japan possesses superb advantages. Planted on her island throne in the midst of the Pacific, she reaches out towards every direction from which that civilization may come, westward through the Suez Canal, under English supervision, and eastward through the Panama Canal (when that is completed), under American protection. Japan will engirdle the globe, thus reaching every quarter in the Old World as well as the New, and gathering in the richest fruits of Western culture and science, which she will proceed to disseminate among the Japanese islands. Along all these waterways,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Western nations will bring their treasures and their civilization to the vast continent of Asia; and will also knock at the door of Japan in their turn. Hearty, indeed, will be the welcome which the Japanese will give to the Western bearers of the civilization from which we have ourselves benefited so much! But the door of Japan must be kept open, for we wish our welcome to be not only hearty, but continuous, as will be the stream of those Western gifts from Europe and America through which we shall alone be enabled, strengthening our own power, to realize our national aspirations, and especially to maintain that peace which is the foundation of progress in the Far East.

For a thousand years or more after the introduction of Chinese culture, which became merged in her ethnic life, Japan had the good fortune to possess an Oriental civilization of her own, embodied in language, art, customs and institutions. But, after the visit of Commodore Perry, in 1853, following the example set us by our ancestors when they introduced Chinese ideas, we turned to the West for culture and science, and thus the laws, the philosophy, the religion and art of Occidental civilization were engrafted upon our institutions. The Japanese mind is earnestly engaged in moulding into one the two forms of culture, the Oriental and the Occidental, its ambition being to harmonize them, even as Rome harmonized the militarism of the northern tribes with the culture of the southern races of Europe.

Such, then, is the ultimate aspiration, the crowning ambition, of the Japanese race. By reconciling and inter-assimilating the two civilizations, Japan hopes to introduce Western culture and science into the continent of Asia, and thus to open up for the benefit of the world, with equal privilege for every nation, and peace assured to all, the teeming wealth of the Chinese Empire. Nothing less than an aim thus ideal and lofty is what Japan aspires to realize; and, should fortune not forsake her, she will be content with nothing less. In the light, therefore, of what has been said, the alarm about a "Yellow Peril" takes on the character of a golden opportunity for Europe and America to become acquainted with the real strength and ambitions of Japan. The same cry, moreover, intended to work us injury and disgrace, provides Japan with a golden opportunity to show the world that selfish ambition has no part in the aspirations of her people.

BARON KENTARO KANEKO.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WHERE AND HOW RUSSIA IS TO GET HER NEXT LOAN.

BY YVES GUYOT.

I.

THERE has been quite a discussion going on over the question of contraband of war, and the whole matter remains very confused and obscure. The fact is that the most efficacious of all kinds of contraband of war is unquestionably gold, for with money all the rest can be obtained. But Russia, which has shown such a disposition to pronounce everything contraband, has displayed no desire to embrace in her anathemas things financial.

Scarcely had the present war broken out when Russia placed at Paris a loan of over $154,000,000. The Russian Government did not begin by informing the French Government of its intention. It first opened up negotiations with bankers and other financiering institutions, and, when all was concluded, then the French Minister of Finance was told of the operation. But he had no ground for complaint. It is not the French Government which has lent Russia money. French capitalists, great and small, find it to their advantage to invest their funds in Russian bonds, quite without any official pressure from the French Government.

It was not in order to be agreeable to Russia that, about 1887, Bismarck boycotted Russian securities in Berlin. And yet, by so doing, he rendered the Russian Government a service for which it cannot be too thankful. He forced Russia to seek elsewhere for future loans. Baron von Morhenheim, then the Russian Ambassador to Paris, easily proved to his government that there was but one centre where it could find what was needed, and that this centre was Paris.

It is universally known that France is a great storehouse for money. It has long had solid fortunes. The statistics concerning

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

direct taxation show eight and a half million property-holders. If we take four as the average size of each French family, we find that 34 million French people have real estate, in great or small quantities, directly or indirectly, out of the whole 39 millions of inhabitants, or 872 persons for every 1000.

Perhaps there is some exaggeration in the generalization that all Frenchmen are economical. But it is certain that the peasant likes to hoard up, the domestic puts by and the working-man is often a wage-earner in the city and a landowner in the country; that, in cities like Lyons and Lille, there is a considerable mass of accumulated wealth. It was declared recently that a certain citizen of Lyons, who had an income of 800,000 francs and had spent in one year 30,000 francs, or 6,000 more than the interest at 3 per cent. on his income, considered himself "foolishly reckless!"

This Lyonese Harpagon simply represented the exaggeration of the spirit of capitalization. But it must be admitted that the tendency to save, when carried to excess, is harmful. The small French capitalist always wishes to make "sure investments." This is his ambition; and yet he sometimes lets his imagination run away with his judgment and invests in schemes of a lottery nature, like that of Panama. Suez had enriched certain persons, and the example was cited in favor of the new venture. So, many small capitalists rushed into the enterprise, and disaster overtook them. This crash coincided with the appearance on the Paris market of the Russian bonds. The Panama disaster turned people with money to invest towards State securities and Russian bonds were benefited by this state of public opinion.

The banks that had the placing of the loan got enormous commissions, and it was thus possible for them to influence opinion, which was not a difficult task, for the public was only too willing to do what was wanted of them. When the Emperor Alexander, father of the present Czar, listened to the French national air—the "Marseillaise" of the Revolution—during Admiral Gervais's visit in 1890, his act was considered by shrewd observers as a first-class advertisement of Russian bonds. The imagination of countless Frenchmen was heated by really childish fancies. The high-sounding word "Alliance" was given to what was in fact only a prosaic military convention, whose purpose was to determine the position and number of troops which

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Russia should have on her western frontier. Then the Czar sent Admiral Avellane with his fleet to Toulon. Thereupon, some of my fellow countrymen, and fellow countrywomen too, I should add, seemed to rise to the seventh heaven of delight. They imagined that it was things of this sort which were going to decide the hard-headed Germans to hand us back Alsace and Lorraine. Two more loans in 1894, however, were the only practical results of all these hurrahing demonstrations,—one of 167 and a half million of rubles, and another, in the same year, of 147 millions. Barnum himself would have envied advertisers of this calibre, and advertisements of this sort.

Then there was the small French capitalist who did all he could to render the comedy a greater success. French State bonds were very high, and the interest very low, and conversions were always probable. Russia had immense unexploited wealth; she had always paid her coupons; the price of her bonds might rise. Here, then, is a good investment, which is less risky than those of an industrial nature. This is the way that the small French capitalist looked at the matter, and he forthwith handed over his savings to the houses and bankers who had Russian interests in charge, and who had quite other and very decided reasons for wishing to handle these savings, and convert them into Russian bonds. The result of all this has been that, up to the present moment, France has taken up some eight billions of francs' worth of Russian State securities. This glance at what has happened in the past will help the reader to guess what is likely to happen in the near future.

II.

When the present war broke out, the vast majority of Frenchmen were astounded. The diplomats of most nations had shown but little perspicacity in not foreseeing this eventuality. It was evident, however, that Japan could not suffer indefinitely the dilatory conduct of the Russian Government. That the generally poorly informed "man in the street" should believe that "little Japan" would go on yielding to "big Russia,"—that can be understood. But that men whose business it was to know the resources of the two belligerents should also have held this same opinion,—this is incomprehensible. So, when the cloud burst, France was in consternation, and on February 10th, there was a veritable panic on the Paris Stock Exchange.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is an old saying in the money-market that the fall in prices reaches the lowest point at the first cannon-shot. But the holders of Russian securities found comfort in repeating to themselves, that the destruction of a part of the Russian fleet was due simply to a surprise; that even if the Russians were beaten on the sea they would certainly triumph on land; that Russia had a big gold-reserve fund, and that she would surely pay the interest on her debt. Furthermore, the great French financial houses did all they could to bolster up Russian bonds. But the stock-brokers were frightened at the large holdings in Russians of some of their clients. So they forced settlements, and the crash of February 20th was the result. From that moment there was no more dealing in Paris with Russian securities. If it is possible to buy Russian bonds, it is impossible to sell them. The stock-broker is master of his own credit, and he now refuses to accept Russian bonds unless the bonds themselves are actually placed in his hands. He even refuses to agree to sell a large sum, declaring that he will be unable to find a buyer.

The transactions of the Paris Stock Exchange are monopolized by seventy stock-brokers, through whose hands must pass all operations in State securities. They decided to suspend all business in future sales in order to keep up to the highest point the prices of Russian bonds. This course, it was said at the time, was recommended by the French Minister of Finance himself, M. Rouvier. But this is a most dangerous proceeding. Bears to-day are bulls to-morrow; and if they do not find buyers, a crash is inevitable. The Paris Stock Exchange is at present in a condition when such a thing may happen at any moment.

When, last spring, the latest Russian loan, for 300 millions of rubles, was negotiated at Paris, M. Rouvier feared lest small bondholders should sell their French securities and those Russian securities which they already possessed, in order to buy the new five-per-cents. So he required that the denomination of the bonds should be 500 francs, which would prevent small purses from buying them, and he also cut down the loan to one-half the original amount,—150 stead of 300 million rubles. But this last restriction was overridden, and the banks accepted subscriptions covering the loan several times over. These same bankers, however, were very careful to keep none of the bonds for themselves, and generously ceded all to their clients. They even

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

went further in their generosity and some of the more important financial establishments shared their commission with these clients in order that the latter might "get all the possible benefit" of the transaction. Clerks, too, in the branch banks of these large houses got a small commission for every bond they succeeded in working off. A small depositor going to one of these banks at this time with a fifty-franc bill in his hand was sure to be importuned by one of these eager employees to invest in the loan. "Buy Russians" was the advice heard on every hand. The reader may judge from this how the next Russian loan will fare when the inevitable moment comes to place it in France.

Nobody knows exactly how Russian finances are administered, as they are not in any way under the control of a representative assembly. The Russian Ministers and officials may present the budget in any way they like. Nobody can tell, consequently, how large or small a part of this latest loan ever actually got into the Russian treasury. The "*Eclair*" newspaper of Paris has disclosed that 30 millions out of the 800 millions of francs were eaten up in commissions. It was first announced that the rate of emission would be 98 francs, which at 5 per cent., would mean an investment at 5.10 per cent. But according to a statement which appeared in the London "Times" of September 15th last, the transaction really cost the Russian Government 6 per cent.

Notwithstanding all the efforts made to prevent it, some of the French holders of Russian bonds sold those which they already had, in order to buy the new ones which were more advantageous. The French bondholder argued in this wise: "This is an investment at more than 5 per cent. That is all I see in it. As Russia is sure to come out ahead on land, she can wait for the day of victory. In the mean time, I will enjoy my larger income. That is all that concerns me."

Consequently, when the news came of Russian defeats on the Yalu and at Liao-Yang, Frenchmen who looked at matters in that way—and their number is legion—were suddenly awakened from a pleasant dream. But thereupon the Russophile newspapers in Paris, more or less inspired by the bankers who placed the loan, began to say and repeat: "The Russians may be beaten at first, but they will win in the end. The finances of Japan will be exhausted before those of Russia."

It is quite true that the credit of Japan is not equal, even now,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

after all that has happened, to that of Russia. The small loan which the former asked for was issued at a rate much higher than that of Russia, and it had to be guaranteed by the earnings of the Japanese customs. But Japan has one great superiority over Russia,—she has but four foreign loans. The sum set aside for the payment of the Japanese debt for the year ending March 31, 1904, was 42,402,000 yen, the yen being about 50 cents. The sum set aside for the payment of the Russian debt was estimated for 1904 at 289,299,000 rubles for a capital of 6,629 millions of rubles. But this figure is only approximative, as the various Russian loans are not all given in rubles.

Another question which is sure to be asked by the foreign money-lender when Russia comes forward for a fresh loan is this: "What is the war costing the two nations?" And the answer to this question ought not to help Russia to find buyers of her future bonds. For these inquisitive inquirers will learn that the army and navy of Japan, which have shown what they can do, cost less than the army and navy of any other country. The Japanese army requires less than 20 millions of dollars per year, while that of Russia requires 200 millions. As regards the navy, the figures are 15 millions for Japan and more than 60 millions for Russia. It will also be asked how this money was spent; and then this question will be put by inquisitive investors: "Are all the resources of Russia which are now used for war purposes being so employed as to obtain a maximum result at a minimum cost?" The London "Times," on the date already given, ventures to doubt this, "when the authorities of high standing charge their government with the cost of the best Welsh steam coal and ship inferior Japanese, making thousands on the transaction."

The cost of the war between Japan and China is known. The former country spent $144,000 per day. It is estimated that she is now spending $250,000 per day or, in round numbers, $7,500,000 per month. During the Chinese war, Japan's total expense, from 1894 to November, 1896, was 200,479,508 yen, of which sum 35,955,000 went to the navy. Japan met this demand on her finances by public loans amounting to 116,804,000 yen, while the Chinese indemnity furnished 78,957,000. The monthly maximum of war expenses for Japan never rose to 20,000,000 yen, and, according to the "Times," this average was not exceeded during the first six months of the present conflict.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Now how is Russia faring from this same point of view? She has practically lost her Port Arthur squadron. An authority, M. Raphael Georges Lévy, who is very friendly to Russia, estimates the monthly cost of the war for Russia at between 30 and 40 millions of dollars. This is probably a fair estimate, for England spent about 24 millions of dollars per month during the Transvaal struggle.

These facts must be beginning to be known to the general public. They are certainly well known in all financial circles, and the knowledge of them cannot improve the borrowing possibilities of Russia. And the longer the war lasts, and the more she will need money, the harder it will be for her to find any money anywhere.

III.

At the beginning of September it was rumored that Russia was trying to find money at Berlin. The German Government took a deep interest in the effort, and the Kaiser could not be too zealous in encouraging Russia to keep up the war. He has every reason for wishing Russia to exhaust her arsenals, soldiers and funds. The weakness of Russia is one of the coefficients of the strength of Germany. To render it possible for her to continue the war by increasing her debt, is one of the services most advantageous to Germany that the latter can offer the former. However, towards the middle of September it was announced that the Berlin bankers did not see their way to accommodating Russia, and so the Government of the Czar was forced to again turn to France.

In spite of the efforts to attenuate the result of the battle of Liao-Yang, this event has not strengthened the credit of Russia either in France or elsewhere. Without doubt, Russia can still make a loan at Paris, but its success will depend on two things,—the amount of the proposed loan and the interest rate. Now, if this rate is too high, it will bring about the crash of which mention was made a moment ago. The present holders of Russian State Rente bonds would sell them in order to buy the new ones. In this way another loan could be floated. But could she float two? That is the question. For a loan now to carry on the war will have to be followed by another to meet the final expenses and the indemnity which Japan is sure to exact and to exact quite justly. Or one very large loan might be offered which

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

would meet both of these needs. But this is the view that the capitalist will take of the matter: "If the new loan," he will argue, "assures Russia the victory, well and good. But if it simply aids in prolonging the struggle, it will also simply weaken Russia still further. The conflict cannot last indefinitely. But the longer it goes on, the greater will be the exigencies of Japan. The Japanese will demand a war indemnity; and then Russia will have to borrow again, and at what rate?" These prudent considerations will not render easier the placing of the future loan.

But the gravest thing about Russia's financial position, from the borrowing point of view, is the fact that she can find but one lender, who has already let her have too much. I, of course, mean France. So, if Paris fails, the St. Petersburg government cannot look elsewhere for outside help. Then the Czar must sink or swim with his own people. But money must be found somewhere and somehow to pay the interest on the immense foreign debt. Gold must be had, and if the French will not loosen their purse-strings, being tired of the thing, then the only recourse left Russia is to begin to use her gold reserve which was accumulated by M. Wischnegradsky, formerly Minister of Finance, and M. de Witte, in order to make it possible to return to specie payment. According to Russian data, there was circulating in Russia, at the end of 1903, 787 millions of gold rubles, and 1,058 other millions were in the vaults of the Bank and the Treasury—a grand total of 920 millions of dollars. On August 1, of this year, the funds in the Bank and the gold in the Treasury were valued at 1,220 millions of rubles.

In two articles published in the important Berlin periodical, the "Deutsche Rundschau," Herr Tankscher concludes that Russia's financial condition is very healthy. But she can keep intact this reserve fund only by borrowing in foreign parts, and, if the day comes when she has to touch this fund, on that day Russian credit will receive a severe blow. It was to prevent this that Russia offered the 800 million francs loan, already mentioned.

The wealth of a country, however, is not based alone on its stock of money. Its industrial and agricultural capacity counts for something. But the present agricultural outlook in Russia is not encouraging. In August, one of the leading Russian dailies, the "Novoye Vremya," stated that in several of the northern provinces lack of forage was causing a large emigration towards

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the richer provinces of the south. Within the memory of man the movement had never been so marked. In the Province of Novgorod, the ruined farmers were selling their cattle, in order to keep from starving. But the south itself has only fair crops this year.

M. Bunge, formerly Russian Minister of Finance, has admitted that the peasants cannot pay all their taxes. At the recent birth of the heir to the throne, the Czar issued an edict adjourning still further the payment of these back taxes. We are told that the peasants' land is distinguished from that of the nobles by the quantity and appearance of the harvest. The latter practise agriculture with machines and on approved modern methods, while the former plough, sow and reap as did their ancestors, paying no attention to the laws of the rotation of crops or any other of the teachings of scientific agriculture. The result is that, if we place the peasant's harvest at 100, the noble's rises to 210.

The situation is scarcely more brilliant if we turn towards the industrial field. M. de Witte was long bent on encouraging manufactures, with two results which he probably did not foresee. He has created revolutionary centres formed of the workmen in the factories, and weak industrial concerns which count on the Government to help them out. Without State aid, they cannot live. The Government pays these houses fifty or sixty per cent. more for articles which would otherwise be bought across the frontier. This is where goes a large part of the money borrowed with so much trouble in foreign countries. So the Russian manufacturer naturally looks upon the present war as a perfect godsend.

But the longer the Russian Government prolongs the war, the more it will ruin the country, and it is not without anxiety that this eventuality is viewed by the French holders of Russian securities. Their faith in the triumph of Russia has been rudely shaken by the falsehoods sent broadcast over the world by the official newsmongers of St. Petersburg. French observers are asking how it happens that the Russian War Office always knows the Japanese losses but never their own. The continuous "orderly retreat" in Manchuria reminds them of what happened during the dark days of 1870-1871, and "the plan of Kuropatkin" resembles very closely that of the famous Trochu. The bluff of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the sailing of the Baltic fleet has caused more than one of my countrymen to say: "Really, the Russians must think us asses!" Credit is a matter of faith. When faith departs, credit goes with it.

I have stated that Russia has no other lender than France. It is true that the Dutch hold some Russian bonds, but the phlegmatic Hollanders would not listen an instant to the idea of taking up a Russian loan. Belgium has already lost more than 100 million dollars in closing out, in 1901, her connection with Russia's industrial enterprises, and she would not risk having her fingers burnt again. Of course, the door of England is shut tight, and I doubt if that of New York is likely to open, notwithstanding the Malachite service which the Czar has so seductively presented to the Stock Exchange. The cold shoulder given in Berlin, as just described, removes Germany from the list. France, then, alone remains, as I have already said. But we have seen that even in France the matter is beset with difficulties. The situation, then, may be summed up in these words: Within a brief period, Russia will be forced to draw on its gold reserve and go back to fiat money.

YVES GUYOT.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION.*

BY SIR ROBERT FINLAY, K.C., M.P., ATTORNEY-GENERAL FOR GREAT BRITAIN.

THE theoretical interest of the subject of International Arbitration is great, its literature enormous; it has been intimately associated in the past with ambitious schemes of international control, and with speculations, some of which seem to us nowadays very fantastic. Its history reaches back to the earliest times of classical antiquity and runs through the Middle Ages; and in our own time the subject has assumed proportions little dreamt of half a century ago. It has a great practical interest; for, with some necessary limitations, there is no doubt that Arbitration is destined to play an increasing part in the history of nations.

The establishment of the permanent Tribunal at The Hague has been an object-lesson for the world. It was, indeed, a striking spectacle that was presented at The Hague last November. In that picturesque little capital, so rich in historical associations, and where at every turn one is reminded of the mighty dead, were gathered together the representatives of eleven different nations, of various races and languages, from the Old World and the New, for the purpose of submitting their differences to the friendly arbitrament of the Tribunal which will be forever associated with the name of The Hague.

It was said by Franklin: "We make daily great improvements in natural, there is one I wish to see in moral, philosophy, the discovery of a plan which will induce and oblige nations to settle their disputes without first cutting one another's throats." It was in the year 1780 that Franklin wrote these words, and his language seems to imply that the remedy which he longed for had not yet been found. It is, indeed, a remarkable fact that International Arbitration, as a means of preventing those sanguinary methods

* Copyright, 1904, by Horace Markley.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which he deprecated, had fallen into almost complete disuse in the sixteenth, seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Its efficacy had, however, been proved long before the time of Franklin, though it must be admitted that the method which he desiderated of obliging nations so to settle their differences is still to seek.

It is not surprising that among the communities of ancient Greece the necessity for some mode of peaceful solution of disputes should have been realized. The country was divided among a large number of petty States, allied, indeed, by blood, by language, by religion, by association in the national games, by a common contempt for their barbarian neighbors, but frequently at war with one another—war which would have been perpetual had there been no means of adjusting the disputes which were constantly arising. Thucydides puts into the mouth of a Spartan king the sentiment that it is not lawful to treat as a wrong-doer one who is ready to arbitrate, and what we should call an arbitration clause was a common feature in Greek treaties. Greek histories present many instances of recourse to arbitration. Sometimes the arbitrator selected was a friendly State; sometimes one who had attained the distinction which was most prized in Greece, that of winner at the Olympic Games; sometimes the Delphic Oracle.

Accounts have come down to us of the earliest, perhaps, of those arbitrations, which took place about six hundred years B.C. One of those wars so frequent in the history of Greece, insignificant in their scale, but romantic in their incidents, and often fraught with grave issues for the future of the world, had broken out between Athens and Megara. Each claimed the right to the possession of an island bearing a name which was destined to become immortal, Salamis. The war languished, and the Athenians became so weary of it that they are said to have passed a law condemning to death any one who proposed that it should be renewed. But the possession of Salamis was to Athens a matter of life and death. There was one man, and one only, in Athens, who saw this clearly, Solon, the law-giver. I need not recall the picturesque stratagem by which he is said to have goaded his countrymen into action, without incurring the penalty of the law. The war was resumed, and when it had gone on for a long time both sides agreed to refer the dispute to the decision of five Lacedæmonian arbitrators, whose names have been preserved by Plutarch. The arbi-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

trators rose above all racial questions, and adjudged the island to Athens.

There was one celebrated institution in ancient Greece which has been regarded by some authors as intrusted with the function not merely of inducing, but of compelling, submission to arbitration. The Amphictyonic Council has been spoken of as *commune Graeciae consilium,* as the States-General of Greece, as clothed with power to decide upon disputes between States and to enforce its decisions. But little trace is to be found in history of its exercise of any such exalted functions. The Amphictyonic League was a confederacy of races dating from the earliest times, and ultimately embracing the most powerful of the Greek States. It was in its essential features a religious association, formed for the protection of the temples of Apollo and Demeter. One of the aims of the confederacy was to mitigate the horrors of war between the various States which it embraced. The quaint form of oath has been preserved by Æschines. By it the members swore that they would never destroy an Amphictyonic town, that they would never cut it off from running water, either in peace or in war, and that if any one made spoil of the treasure of the god, they would punish him with hand and foot and voice and all their might.

For the enforcement of its decrees the Amphictyonic Council, like the Pope when he intervened in the disputes of princes in the Middle Ages, had at its disposal only spiritual weapons. To be excluded from the Pythian Games and the Temple at Delphi was a sentence of excommunication. But the Council from time to time called in the aid of the secular arm, and it made a memorable and disastrous contribution to Greek history by the part it played in accelerating the subjugation of Greece by invoking the aid of Philip of Macedon in the third and fourth Sacred Wars.

Two curious instances of submission to the arbitration of the Amphictyonic Council are recorded, but it did little, if anything, in the way of promoting peace among the communities of Greece. *Stat magni nominis umbra.*

To the history of International Arbitration the Romans contributed little or nothing. While they were making their conquests, they were little disposed to submit their claims to any arbitrament but that of the god of battles. They were never troubled with any doubts as to the justice of their wars. Cases

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

justifying the verdict, "*Eas res puro pioque duello repetundas censeo,*" were, as Hallam says, prodigiously frequent in the opinion of the Romans. When their conquests had been completed, there were no nations left to arbitrate with. The *Pax Romana* reigned everywhere, and the Senate or Cæsar was its supreme arbiter.

There is, indeed, one institution, dating from the earliest times of Roman history, the importance of which, as bearing on International Arbitration and International Law, has been much exaggerated. Some modern authors have found in the *Fetiales* a permanent tribunal of Arbitration between Rome and other nations, to whose decision, based on the principles of International Law, was referred the question of the justice or the injustice of every war before it was undertaken. Bossuet speaks of them as a holy institution, which puts to shame those Christians into whom even their religion has not been able to inspire charity and peace. A distinguished modern author on International Law (Calvo) says: "Among the Romans no war was declared without the intervention of the *Fetiales,* whose principal mission, according to Plutarch, was not to permit hostilities before every hope of obtaining arbitration was extinguished."

It has, however, been shrewdly remarked that there is not a single instance in Roman history in which the *Fetiales* pronounced unjust any war on which their country was bent. Their real function was that of fulfilling those curious formalities in the declaration of war and in the conclusion of peace, which to the Roman mind were so essential. It is on the points of form only that we find them consulted, and the *Jus Fetiale,* which some have supposed to be synonymous with International Law, was in fact concerned only with its procedure. Whatever the origin of the institution, its function was but to lend the sanction of form to that upon which the Senate and the people of Rome had determined.

The greatness of Rome and the permanence of her empire formed the inspiration of the greatest of Roman poets. In his majestic lines we still can realize that passion of empire which ennobled the Roman race.

> "Now, thy Forum roars no longer,
> Fallen every purple Cæsar's dome—
> Tho' thine ocean-roll of rhythm
> Sound forever of Imperial Rome."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Even after "the fierce giants of the North" had broken in, men could not believe that the Empire of Rome had indeed come to an end. They had believed it eternal, and its traditions were transferred to Emperors elected beyond the Alps.

That the Emperor was, indeed, the heir of all the prerogatives of Imperial Rome was throughout the Middle Ages assumed as too clear for argument. In that most curious of treatises, "*De Monarchiâ*," Dante devotes himself to proving that there must be one Sovereign or Emperor supreme above all others; that God had given the sovereignty of the world to the people of Rome; and that the Emperor, as wielding that authority, was independent of the Pope.

In Dante's view universal monarchy is necessary for the good of mankind. He argues that there must be some means of deciding, and deciding authoritatively, controversies between different States. "It is manifest," he says, "that there may be controversy between any two princes where the one is not subject to the other, either from the fault of themselves or even of their subjects. Therefore, between them there should be means of judgment; and since, when one is not subject to the other, he cannot be judged by the other (for there is no rule of equals over equals), there must be a third power of wider jurisdiction within the circle of whose laws both may come. . . . We must come to that judge who is first and highest, by whose judgments all controversies must be directly or indirectly decided, and he will be Monarch or Emperor. Monarchy is, therefore, necessary to the world, and this the philosopher saw when he said, 'The world is not intended to be disposed in evil order; in a multitude of rulers there is evil, therefore let there be one Prince.'"

In establishing the right of the people of Rome to universal dominion, Dante assumed that he had established the same right as still existing in the Emperor.

The Emperor was no mere arbitrator whose jurisdiction reposed upon consent. His claim was that he stood above all other kings of Europe, and was entitled to regulate and coerce them. "Placed in the midst of Europe," says Mr. Bryce, "the Emperor was to bind its tribes into one body, reminding them of their common faith, their common blood, their common interest in each other's welfare. And he was therefore above all things, professing, indeed, to be upon earth the representative of the Prince of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Peace, bound to listen to complaints, and to redress the injuries inflicted by sovereigns and peoples upon each other, to punish offenders against the public order of Christendom; to maintain throughout the world, looking down as from a serene height upon the schemes and quarrels of meaner potentates, that supreme good without which neither arts nor letters, nor the gentler virtues of life can rise and flourish."

It was a noble dream, but it never was translated into fact. A vague predominance among the princes of Europe was indeed accorded to the Emperor, but his claims were merely the afterglow of that sun of Roman Empire which had set forever. The influence of the Holy Roman Empire dwindled, until in the eighteenth century Voltaire but expressed the sentiment of Europe, when he said that it was neither Holy, nor Roman, nor an Empire.

Much more real than the majestic, but shadowy, pretensions of the Empire was the influence exerted in mediæval Europe by the Papacy. The Pope claimed to be the supreme judge among kings, not by consent, but as of right. These claims play a great part in the history of the Middle Ages. They were sometimes acquiesced in, sometimes resisted. They were never resisted with more spirit than by the Parliament of Scotland, held at Aberbrothock in the year 1320, after the Pope had issued a Bull in support of the pretensions of Edward II. to the sovereignty of Scotland. The reply of the Scottish Parliament was couched in a strain of unusual vigor. They informed the Pope that, if he encouraged the English in their aggression, he would be held responsible to God for the loss of life which would ensue; for, said this memorable document, "as long as a hundred Scotsmen are left alive, we will never be subject to the dominion of England."

Instances are not wanting in which the Pope was, by consent of the parties, selected as arbitrator to decide international disputes, but he assumed a jurisdiction far transcending that of a mere arbitrator. The most celebrated instance of this is to be found in the Bull by which Alexander VI., in 1493, drew an imaginary line from one pole to the other, and by it divided between Spain and Portugal the territory discovered in the New World. Towards the close of the eighteenth century, this Bull was urged by Spain in support of her pretensions to the northwest coast of America, including the territory which formed recently the subject of the Alaska Arbitration — pretensions

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which culminated in the seizure, in 1789, of British vessels at Nootka Sound, and brought the two countries to the verge of war. At the end of the nineteenth century, in the Arbitration as to the frontiers of Venezuela and British Guiana, one of the arguments in favor of Venezuela was based on this Bull, as a judicial decision by the Supreme Judge of Christendom.

"During the Middle Ages," it was said in the Venezuelan Counter case, "and until after the discovery of America, the Pope was the recognized arbiter of the civilized world. His word was in those days supreme." But, on the other hand, only thirty years after it was issued this Bull was treated with scant respect by the King of France, Francis I. "What!" he said, "the King of Spain and the King of Portugal quietly divide between them all America, without allowing me, as their brother, to take a share! I should much like to see the article in Adam's will which gives them this vast inheritance."

By the beginning of the seventeenth century the influence of the Papacy as the arbiter of Europe had waned. The controlling power claimed for the Holy Roman Empire had never been a reality. Europe had been devastated by religious and dynastic wars. If any check was to be placed on the ambition of princes, and the animosities of nations, it appeared that it could be found only in a federation of the States of Europe. Such was the governing idea of the great plan which at the time of his death engaged the attention of Henry IV., the greatest soldier and statesman of his age, the best beloved of French kings, whose memory is still green in the hearts of his people.

The vast possessions of the House of Austria, in Spain, in Italy, in Germany, and in the Low Countries, had excited the jealousy of all other European Powers, and it was feared that the dream of universal monarchy might be converted into a reality. Henry proposed, in the first place, to break effectually the power of the House of Austria, and to strip it of all its possessions in Europe except Spain. For this purpose a great confederacy had been organized. Henry himself was about to take the field, when, in a moment, the dagger of Ravaillac changed the future of Europe. But the destruction of the House of Austria was to have been only the first step in the execution of the *grand dessein*, as it is given to us in full detail in that most fascinating of books, the Memoirs of Henry's great minister, Sully. When this first

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and necessary step had been taken, there was to be formed a sort of Republic of Christendom, consisting of all the States of Europe under the headship of the Emperor—so much force was there still in the tradition of the Holy Roman Empire. The object was, as Sully tells us, to deliver the nations from the crushing burden of military expenditure, to prevent those bloody wars which had desolated Europe, to establish peace, and to unite the States of the Republic of Christendom in an indissoluble bond.

That Republic was to consist of fifteen States—six hereditary kingdoms, France, Spain, England, Denmark, Sweden and Lombardy: five elective, the Empire, the Papacy, Poland, Hungary and Bohemia: and four republics, Venice, Italy, Switzerland and the Low Countries. The Emperor was to be the head and first magistrate of this Republic of States. A Senate, moulded on the Amphictyonic Council, consisting of seventy deputies from the fifteen Powers, was to sit at some central point, to consult on the interests of Christendom, to arrange disputes, and to settle all the affairs, civil, political and religious, of Europe, in its relations with Powers in other parts of the world. The confederacy of Europe was to have an army of 270,000 infantry, and 50,000 cavalry, and Henry had settled in his own mind the quota which was to be supplied by each State. This army was not to remain idle, for the Turk was to be driven out of Europe, and it is interesting to recall that the imagination of Henry as a boy had been fired by the victory of Don John at Lepanto, and that one of his famous ten wishes was to win a battle in person against the King of Spain, and another against the Sultan.

The kingdom of Prussia as yet did not exist, and the Electorate of Brandenburg, out of which so much has grown, was not of sufficient consequence to deserve any special mention by Sully among the States of the Republic of Christendom.

Spain was to be compensated for the loss of her other possessions in Europe, by having assigned to her whatever she might desire to take in the three remaining Continents of the World. There was to be no colonial empire but that of Spain. So far, indeed, was Sully from having any vision of Britain beyond the seas, and of an empire greater than that of Spain ever was, that he speaks of the British Isles as if they were a sort of continent by themselves, in which their people might dwell quiet and secure, having no business with any man, and minding their own affairs.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Such schemes of federation have often been propounded by jurists, by philosophers and by poets. This is the single instance in which such a project was seriously entertained by a great King and a great Minister.

Fifteen years after the death of Henry IV. appeared the memorable work of Grotius, the father of International Law. The publication in 1625 of his treatise "*De Jure Belli et Pacis*," made, to use the words of Hallam, an epoch in the philosophical and almost in the political history of Europe. He strenuously advocated arbitration as a means of avoiding war. But he went further, and desired that nations should not only be induced, but also obliged, to settle their differences peaceably. It would be useful, he says, and is almost necessary, that Congresses should be held of Christian Powers, for the decision of controversies and for compelling obedience.

The language of Grotius is sober and measured, but the same can hardly be said of many of the schemes of this sort which have been launched, some of them by men bearing very eminent names. The Abbé de St. Pierre, early in the eighteenth century, proposed a scheme which involved the establishment of an army of the Federation of Europe, which would make war on any sovereign disobeying a judgment of the International Court. On the eve of the commencement of the wars of the French Revolution, Bentham prepared a plan for a universal and permanent peace, with a common tribunal, a reduction of standing armies, and the emancipation of all colonies. When the revolutionary wars were at the hottest, the philosopher Kant put forward a project for a permanent Congress of States, republican constitutions in all countries, and the abolition not only of national armies, but also of national debts.

Many other schemes for national organization have followed. In some of them, every detail has been settled, even to the salaries of the officials.

No such scheme ever has taken, and no such scheme ever will take, its place in the world of realities. Europe has fallen back upon a plan less ambitious but more practicable, arbitration resting on the consent of the parties to the dispute; and we may hope that its adoption, though it never can abolish war, will at least greatly diminish its frequency.

In truth, no International Authority with power to enforce the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

decrees of the tribunal of arbitration is either necessary or desirable. The list of international arbitrations during the nineteenth century is a very long one; and yet there is hardly a single case in which there has been any difficulty as to compliance with the award. In the Alabama Arbitration, a sum was awarded to the United States so enormous that it is reported that to the present day the American Government has not been able to find claimants for all of it. Sir Alexander Cockburn, the distinguished representative of Great Britain upon the Geneva Tribunal, dissented in the strongest terms from that award. But Great Britain never dreamt of refusing to comply with it. The enforcement of awards may safely be left to the good faith of the parties, and the honor of nations. There is no necessity for any International Sheriff's Officer.

Submission to arbitration must rest upon the free consent of the nations concerned. The establishment of an International Tribunal before which any State might sue another, would be a measure of very doubtful utility. Litigation of this sort between nations would probably cause more friction than it would prevent. As between individuals, there must be power to take one another to law: but the process, however necessary, is not one which is usually found to conduce to friendly feeling between the litigants. One of the highest compliments ever paid to a judge was that he was able to send away even those against whom he had decided *aequos placatosque*—the merit of the achievement was measured by the difficulty of the task. A compulsory tribunal, before which any nation might be haled by any other to answer claims which it might consider unfounded and frivolous, would, indeed, be a dangerous experiment. But a tribunal whose jurisdiction rests entirely upon consent stands on a different footing altogether, and experience has shown that nations which meet in the amicable contest of voluntary arbitration are all the better friends for it.

The powers to be conferred upon International arbitrators may vary indefinitely according to the terms of submission. Sometimes, as in the Behring Sea Arbitration, their functions are limited to deciding on questions of International Law and of strict right. Sometimes, as in the arbitration as to the boundary of British Guiana and Venezuela, they have conferred upon them a larger discretion, with power to say what is fair to be done. If

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

such larger functions be intrusted to the tribunal, there are some questions dealt with in the past by Congresses, which may in the future be disposed of by arbitration. But International Arbitration can never altogether supersede International Congresses. Their spheres are different. If questions of large and general policy have to be settled between nations they may find it expedient to meet in Congress. Machinery which is admirably adapted for solving questions of right in particular cases, is not suited for settling such wider problems. As their spheres are different, so are their methods. The methods of the tribunal of arbitration are judicial. There meet in friendly rivalry the Bars of the countries concerned, and the award is the judgment of a Court. The methods of the Congress are diplomatic. It was said by an eye-witness of the Congress of Vienna, that a kingdom was partitioned or augmented at a ball, an indemnity was granted at a dinner, a constitution was projected at a *battue;* that sometimes a *bon mot* or a happy remark concluded a Treaty which would hardly have been brought to pass by many conferences and long correspondence.

But, beneficial as is the rôle of Arbitration, there are some questions which no country will consent to leave to the judgment of any Court or any arbitrator. Every nation must be the guardian of its own honor. Every nation must decide for itself questions vitally affecting its independence or its essential interests. Some stakes are too big for arbitration. Some issues are too tremendous to be submitted to any but the dread ordeal of battle. It has been said that there hardly ever was a good war, and hardly ever a bad peace. But there are sometimes greater evils than war. There are some conclusions to which no nation ought to submit until everything has been staked and lost.

The United States are a Federation of a peculiarly intimate type, and have always possessed, in their magnificent institution of the Supreme Court, a tribunal, described by John Stuart Mill as international, for the decision of questions arising between the different States. Yet, when the great question of the rights of these States as against the Central Government arose, it could be settled only by the gigantic War of the Secession. In the sublime language of Bacon, "Wars are suits of appeal to the tribunal of God's Justice, where there are no superiors on earth to determine the case."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But, though war cannot be abolished, the occasions of war may be greatly diminished by International Arbitration. Some wars are inevitable. They result from the collision of great principles or vital interests. Their true causes lie far deeper than the incidents which ostensibly cause the rupture. But, how many wars have there been which, without any such overpowering force behind them, have originated from comparatively small beginnings! When the passions of nations become inflamed, some trivial matter is liable to assume monstrous proportions.

Take two events in our recent history, the dispute over the Alabama claims, and the dispute over the Venezuelan boundary. Either of these might well have led to war. They were both settled by arbitration.

It used to be said that war is the game of kings. But perhaps the greatest danger to peace is that, if there is prolonged controversy over some matter, however insignificant in itself, the feelings and the national pride of the people of each country may be involved to such an extent as to render peaceful solution difficult or impossible. When national animosities have been awakened, any spark may kindle a conflagration. The task of the statesman in averting war is immensely facilitated if he finds ready to his hands the machinery for a peaceful settlement. How many wars might have been averted in the past if there had always been in existence, by the common consent of nations, such a tribunal as that of The Hague, whose open portals invite arbitration.

If it be true that "the sight of means to do ill deeds, makes ill deeds done," it is no less true that the existence of such a permanent tribunal, to which any question may be referred, must make for the cause of peace. The maxim, "*si vis pacem, para bellum*," has a great deal of truth in it; but the very fact that there is ready to hand a great instrument of war may sometimes bring it about. May we not hope that the fact of the existence of this great instrument of peace may remove occasions for war, and that nations will more and more recognize the truth of the weighty words of the great Scottish Jurist, the first Lord Stair: "Kings and States ought not to be both judges and parties, when others can be had; but before they enter into war, they ought to demand satisfaction, ... and not decline arbitration when an independent judge can be had"?

ROBERT FINLAY.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SHOULD THE SAFETY OF EMPLOYEES AND TRAVELLERS ON RAILROADS BE PROMOTED BY LEGISLATION?

BY JOHN J. ESCH, MEMBER OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WHEN the combined losses of both the Japanese and Russian armies for the five days of awful fighting, from August 26th to the fall of Liao-Yang, was announced to the world as amounting, in killed and wounded, to over 30,000 men, all the world shuddered. When the Interstate Commerce Commission, in its last Annual Report, made public the fact that, for the year ending June 30th, 1903, the passengers and employees killed and injured on the railroads of the United States amounted to a frightful total of 49,531, the statement excited little comment. Wreck has followed wreck with such regularity, during the last twelve months, as to make the reports of them in the daily press no longer sensational, but rather commonplace. This deplorable record of casualties has been on the increase for years; and, for the year ending March 3rd, 1904, it shows 427 passengers killed, 8,006 injured, 3,479 employees killed and 43,025 injured, making a grand total of 54,937, being greater by almost 6,000 than the losses which resulted from the three days' fighting at Gettysburg. It is a concrete illustration such as this which makes us alive to the situation, and inspires the inquiry: "What can and what ought to be done about it?"

As about eighty-four per cent. of the casualties on railroads occur among the employees, and as the coupling of cars and the falling from and riding upon cars have been largely responsible for the deaths and injuries among the employees, Congress was appealed to by them to enact safety-appliance laws for their protection. The agitation began in 1888 by the adoption of resolu-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tions by the Railroad Commissioners of the country, at a meeting held at Washington in the spring of that year, and this was followed up by a petition, signed by about 10,000 members of the Brotherhood of Railroad Brakemen, asking the Interstate Commerce Commission to take steps to bring about "the adoption of automatic couplers and brakes on freight-cars used on the railroads of the United States, and strongly appealing to the Commission to urge upon Congress the necessity of national legislation, that the terrible slaughter of brakemen on the railroads of the country might be diminished."

With the record of 2,000 employees killed and more than 20,000 injured for the year ending June 30th, 1889, with resolutions adopted by all the Grand Lodges of the Railroad Brotherhoods appealing for help, President Harrison was so much impressed that, on December 3rd, 1889, he sent a special message to Congress urging remedial legislation in these words: "It is a reproach to civilization that any class of American workmen, in the pursuit of a necessary and useful vocation, should be subjected to a peril of life and limb as great as that of a soldier in time of war."*

As about forty per cent. of the casualties among employees resulted from coupling cars, or setting brakes, Congress first directed its attention to legislation which would lessen if not obviate these occasions of danger and loss. As a result, the act of March 2nd, 1893, was passed, which sought to relieve brakemen from the necessity of going on top of or between cars, by requiring all railroads engaged in interstate commerce to equip their cars with automatic couplers, grab-irons or handholds on the ends or sides, and power or train brakes on their locomotives, "with a power driving-wheel brake, and appliances for operating the train-brake system."

Prior to the passage of the above act, various railroad managers, with commendable enterprise and actuated by humane motives, had begun of their own accord to apply different kinds of automatic couplers and brakes on the cars of their respective lines; but trainmen soon discovered that it was as dangerous to use diverse devices as it had been to use the old link and pin. Uniformity of device and of height of draw-bar, not only on each railroad system, but on all systems engaged in interstate traffic,

* O'Neill's Report, First Session Forty-second Congress.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was found necessary. Such uniformity could only come through Congressional action. The above act, therefore, authorized the American Railway Association through its experts to recommend a standard height of draw-bar for freight-cars for each of the several gauges in use in the United States.

To further safeguard brakemen or trainmen, and to prevent the necessity of their going on top of the cars, day or night, or in any weather, Congress, by an act approved March 2nd, 1903, required that not less than fifty per cent. of the cars in a train operated with power or train brakes "shall have their brakes used and operated by the engineer of the locomotive drawing such train, and all power-braked cars in such trains which are associated together with said fifty per centum shall have their brakes so used and operated." The act of March 2nd, 1893, originally limited the commencement of its operation to January 1st, 1898, but the time was subsequently extended to August 1st, 1900. The act of March 2nd, 1903, became operative on September 1st, 1903. Anticipating the former law, some of the leading roads began installing the safety appliances which it prescribed shortly after its passage. As these are the only statutes enacted by Congress to promote the safety of railroad employees, it is pertinent to inquire whether they have been successful or not. If successful, Congress, in view of the deplorable disasters of the last twelve months, might wisely undertake legislation to promote the safety of passenger traffic.

Statistics filed with the Interstate Commerce Commission show, making a comparison by years, "that, while the number killed and injured compared with the total employees has changed very little, the proportionate number of trainmen killed by coupling and uncoupling was reduced one-half between 1893 and 1896, a slight increase over 1896 being shown for 1900; and the number injured, decreased one-fifth between 1893 and 1896, was reduced one-half between 1893 and 1900. A like change of proportion is to be noted for switchmen, flagmen, etc. Deaths by falling from trains and engines have been materially decreased, but injuries from that cause have remained about the same. . . . On the whole it may be claimed, then, that the Federal law of 1893 has had a decided effect in decreasing accidents in the departments to which it applies."*

*Industrial Commission, Vol. 19, pages 914-915.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Notwithstanding these satisfactory results, the fact that for the twelve months ending March 31st, 1904, there were 104 trainmen killed and 1,358 wounded, in coupling and uncoupling cars, indicates that the acts of Congress passed for the benefit of trainmen have not had full fruition. While some allowance should be made for the enormous increase in freight traffic since 1900, which has resulted in the employment of many inexperienced men, Government inspectors report that there has been a lax compliance with the provisions of the safety-appliance law on the part of many railroad officials; that, while standard brakes and couplers may have been fully installed, there has been neglect in keeping them in constant repair, especially as to the gauging of couplers, the uncoupling apparatus, the retaining valve on the air-brakes, and the slighting of repairs on foreign cars.

That the fullest protection to trainmen as intended by Congress may be attained, the Government inspection force, now consisting of only fifteen men, should be largely increased. The inspectors should have power to peremptorily forbid the use of cars, engines or trains not fully equipped as required by law, and the railroads themselves should increase their repair and instruction crews. These things being done, the safety-appliance law will more fully justify itself, and the number of trainmen killed and injured annually will be reduced to a minimum.

Thus far, the safety of trainmen only has been considered. The results of but a short operation of the safety-appliance law have so largely reduced the casualties among trainmen, by obviating the necessity of their going between or on top of the cars, that it may next be asked: Can their safety be further promoted by legislation safeguarding them, as well as switch-tenders and other employees, against collisions and derailments, from which causes, for the twelve months ending March 31st, 1904, there were 848 killed and 5,839 injured? Whatever legislation would protect trainmen against collisions and derailments would likewise protect baggagemen, expressmen, railway mail-clerks and the travelling public. Such legislation, therefore, if reasonable and practicable, affecting millions of our people, as it would, is worthy of most careful consideration.

Such legislation should have two objects; first, to afford safety against carelessness, forgetfulness, lack of discipline or faults of omission in general; second, to afford safety in spite of such

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

carelessness, forgetfulness, lack of discipline and faults of omission. In connection with the first object, a study of the "Quarterly Accident Bulletins" of the Interstate Commerce Commission, for the twelve months ending March 31st, 1904, being the last statistics obtainable, shows:

Nine collisions, with a total of 38 killed and 35 injured, and property loss of $77,770, caused by excessive hours on duty, and the falling asleep of engine-men, flagmen or operators:

Twelve collisions, with a total of 7 killed and 79 injured, and property loss of $69,255, caused by the employment of young or inexperienced men;

Twelve collisions, with a total of 47 killed and 223 injured, and property loss of $224,924, caused by the misreading of train orders by engine-men and conductors;

Thirteen collisions, with a total of 72 killed and 208 injured, and property loss of $107,037, caused by ignoring signals and disobedience of orders on the part of engine-men, conductors and brakemen.

To the above classification of causes of railroad collisions and derailments may be added those resulting from forgetfulness of orders, misunderstandings as to the right to the track, "overlooking a train," mistakes of operators and despatchers in reading, transmitting or delivering orders. From these latter causes, during the months of April, May and June, 1903, alone, 33 deaths and 260 injuries resulted.

The writer believes that a Federal law, supplemented by State enactments, should be passed, prohibiting, by means of severe penalties, railroad companies from requiring trainmen, or other employees connected with the operation of trains, to work continuously for an excessive number of hours. No demand of traffic, however urgent, should deprive passengers of the service of alert, wakeful and attentive operatives. For like reasons, mere boys should be prohibited from being employed as operators; and men with little or no experience, and ignorant of their duties or of the road, should be prohibited from being employed as flagmen, engine-men, brakemen, or conductors. A thorough apprenticeship, for a specified term, with rigorous tests and examinations, should precede employment, while color-blindness and drunkenness on duty should bar or terminate it.

It may be difficult, if not impossible, to legislate against the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

misreading or disobedience of orders, ignoring of signals, and many other causes of railroad accidents. Federal legislation might make some of these acts criminal and punishable with fines and imprisonment, but State laws now render these punishable under different degrees of manslaughter. Ultimately, the best remedy lies in a stricter enforcement of discipline on the part of the officials of the railroads themselves. To lay off an engine-man for a month or two for ignoring or running past a signal, even when no loss results, or a conductor for misreading an order, is not a punishment, but a vacation. This stricter discipline, promoting, as it will, the safety of life and limb, should be enforced irrespective of the demands of labor-unions in behalf of their members, on the one hand, or the officious interference of railroad officials, on the other.

The employees on American railroads are intelligent, capable and well organized. The officials who manage and operate these roads are ambitious, resourceful and, as a rule, progressive; and yet, to both, a record of such numerous and costly wrecks as have happened within a year should come as a reproach. A few of the most disastrous wrecks, with causes, are here set forth:

December 23rd, 1903, near Connellsville, Pa., 65 killed and 4 wounded. The track was obstructed by timbers which had fallen from a car insecurely loaded.

December 27th, 1903, near Grand Rapids, Mich., 18 killed and 57 injured. The engine-man passed a station at which he should have stopped for a despatcher's order. He claimed that the signal had been blown out by a high wind.

January 6th, 1904, near Topeka, Kansas, 18 killed and 37 injured. The train passed the station without stopping. The conductor and engine-man did not correctly identify a freight-train met at the station.

July 12th, 1904, at Midvale, N. J., 17 killed and 50 injured. A collision between passenger and excursion trains, caused by a tower-man's lowering his signal too soon.

July 13th, 1904, at Glenwood, Ill., 24 killed and 72 wounded. The passenger-train collided with a freight-train which should have remained on a side track.

August 8th, 1904, near Eden, Col., 100 killed (estimated). A bridge over a dry run gave way as a result of a sudden flood.

September 24th, 1904, near Newmarket, Tenn., 62 killed and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

over 100 injured. The crew of the westbound train failed to carry out its orders to meet an eastbound train at a given station.

To these instances might be added scores of minor collisions and derailments, resulting in death and injury to hundreds, and in property losses of over ten millions for the year. Compared with the casualties on English, German, French and Austrian railroads, this record is humiliating, even after full allowance has been made for our greater mileage, more rapid extension of lines, heavier freight traffic and lack of public supervision. But no comparison in the end fixes standards. Neither our railroad officials nor the men they employ should be content until, to the best system in the world, there has been added the best management; and, if some roads have not enough enterprise or initiative to bring about such a consummation, legislation should furnish the spur.

The ideal railway line contemplates the use of the double-track or, what is better, the four-track system. On such a system, head-on or butting collisions, which for the year ending March 31st, 1904, numbered 1,040 and resulted in deaths to 320 and injury to 2,792, would become rare, if not impossible. Such collisions, because of the greater speed and momentum of the colliding trains, entailed for the same year about one-third more deaths and injuries than rear-end collisions, although there were 862 more of the latter. It would be idle, and in some cases ruinous and impracticable, to compel by legislation, either State or national, the construction of double-track or multiple-track systems. That is an improvement which time, increase of business and enterprise must be left to bring about.

The legislation thus far suggested as practicable and necessary for the safety of employees and the travelling public would not entail much expense upon the roads, beyond such expense as would follow an increase in the number of the force; but the compulsory installation by law of the so-called "block-signal system," as an efficient aid to the safety of travel, would mean large expenditure. In this connection, it is first necessary to determine whether this system has proven itself to be efficient, and, if so, whether through Congressional action the railroads of the country should be obliged to install it at such times and with such rapidity and on such portions of the line as Congress might prescribe.

The block-signal system is no new device. Progressive roads

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in this country and abroad have made use of it for years. There are at the present over thirty thousand miles, equal to about one-seventh of the total mileage, of American roads equipped with it, embracing the parts of most roads where freight and passenger traffic is heaviest. Ever since Judge Cooley was Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, that Commission has called attention to the efficacy of the block or space system in promoting the safety of railroad travel, and has repeatedly urged legislation to install it. The argument has recently been made that "the installation of the block-signal system on nearly thirty thousand miles of the busiest railways of the United States fails to show any appreciable effect in reducing the total of casualties." Granting this to be true, who can state how many more casualties there might have been had such system not been installed. For the year ending June 30th, 1902, ten out of eleven of the worst collisions occurred on roads not using the block system. Great Britain has been making use of it universally for years past, and to its use may be largely ascribed the remarkable fact that not a single passenger was killed in train accidents in 1901, and only six in 1902. The slow but voluntary extension of this system by some of the leading roads in this country is the best evidence of its efficiency. No system, however perfect, whether automatic or otherwise, can wholly eliminate the human factor in the problem of safety. Trainmen will forget, flagmen and tower-men will fall asleep, repair-men will become negligent, officials will relax discipline, in short some one will blunder; and yet this system is the most practicable method thus far put in use to insure safety.

So satisfactory has been the use of the block-signal system that the Interstate Commerce Commission has felt warranted in recommending to Congress for passage the draft of a bill requiring its use. Recognizing the cost of installation, the bill extends the time of installation over a period of years, that portion of a given line with the heaviest traffic being required to be first attended to. For the purposes of the proposed legislation, the Commission holds "the block system to mean the methods and rules by means of which the movement of railroad trains (cars or engines) may be regulated in such manner that an interval of space of absolute length may, at all times, be maintained between the rear end of a train and the forward end of the train next following."*

* Interstate Commerce Commission, 17 Annual Rept., page 344.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

As the double or multiple tracks render head-on or butting collisions less probable, the block system has had the same effect in regard to rear-end collisions. As to the former, legislation to force installation would be in many instances ruinous and unreasonable; as to the latter, it would be wise and ultimately profitable. In support of any law which promotes safety, but which imposes large expenditures on the railroads, there should be offset the lessened costs and damages resulting from the lessened number of wrecks. For the fiscal year ending 1903, the loss from collisions and derailments, exclusive of litigated damages, amounted to over nine and one-half million dollars. With semaphores costing from fifty to seventy-five dollars apiece, wiring twenty-five to thirty-five dollars per mile, and signal-men's cabins five hundred dollars each, many miles of road could annually be fitted out with the block system out of the damage annually sustained by the railroads of the country. The writer firmly believes in the necessity and efficacy of this system and in legislation, both State and Federal, which will require its installation.

The second object of legislation, as already stated, is to provide safety in spite of carelessness, forgetfulness, lack of discipline or faults of omission, and, it might be added, in spite of defects of roadways, equipment and of unforeseen obstructions. This object can be attained by requiring baggage, express, mail, smoking, chair, and tourist cars—in fact, all cars except sleepers—to be so strongly built as to prevent telescoping and destruction by fire in case of collision or derailment or other accidents. It is a well-known fact that, in the average wreck, the passengers in the smoking-car and in the so-called "day coaches" suffer most. In all collisions the casualties are almost wholly confined to these cars and coaches; and, even in rear-end collisions, the force of impact, transmitted through the sleepers, spends itself upon them. The Associated Press reports of some of the worst wrecks in recent years fully attest the truth of these statements.

In the awful wreck at Chatsworth, Illinois, August 10th, 1887, in which 85 were killed, "ten cars, being telescoped, were piled across and on top of the two engines, but no one in the sleepers was hurt."

In the wreck near Tiffin, Ohio, January 4th, 1887, in which 19 were killed and 24 injured, "the crash came, telescoping the coaches and piling them upon each other."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In the wreck near White Sulphur Springs, West Virginia, December 28th, 1889, in which 11 were killed and 25 injured, "all killed were in the smoking-car, which was telescoped by another car, every person in the car being killed."

But we can find abundant confirmation in the more important wrecks which have occurred within a year, and which have already been referred to. In the wreck near Connellsville, December 23rd, 1903, "nearly all killed were in the smoking-car. The two Pullman coaches had their trucks knocked from under them, but did not suffer damage otherwise, and none of the passengers were seriously injured."

In the wreck near Grand Rapids, Mich., December 27th, 1903, "the trains met with a terrific crash, the baggage and smoking car on each train being instantly reduced to kindling-wood. . . . No person occupying cars other than the baggage and smoking cars, with very few exceptions, were seriously injured."

In the wreck at Topeka, Kansas, January 6th, 1904, "the smoking-car was overturned and pushed through the car behind it. All the passenger-coaches except the last two Pullman coaches were piled up in a heap."

In the wreck near Midvale, N. J., July 12th, 1904, "the engine of the regular train pierced the rear car of the excursion train the greater part of its length, and drove the front end of the car into the car ahead. The killed and injured were in these two cars."

In the recent bad wreck near Glenwood, Ill., "the engine and baggage-cars of the passenger-train went clear through the freight and were piled up in a heap of wreckage on the further side of the switch. The first coach of the picnic train plunged into the wreckage, and buried itself in a mass of kindling-wood under the demolished baggage-car. Nearly all of the passengers of the first coach were caught beneath the mass of debris."

In the wreck near Newmarket, Tenn., one of the worst on record, "the second coach ploughed its way into a bank in such a manner that the other cars were jammed into it and, pushed in by the weight of heavy Pullmans, were crushed like eggshells."

This monotonously doleful tale of death and disaster could be prolonged, but enough has been given to make reasonable the following conclusions: first, the position of the lighter cars and coaches between the heavy sleepers and the still heavier locomo-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tive subjects them to being telescoped in case of collisions; second, if no change in the construction is to be made, such cars and coaches should be placed in the rear of the train, as is already the practice on some limited trains on certain roads; third, baggage, mail, express, smoking, chair, and tourist cars, and all day coaches, as at present constructed, are too frail to resist the impact of collisions; fourth, the crushing of such cars increases the danger from fire, which adds the only element lacking to make the complete holocaust.

The weak construction of the average mail, baggage, express, and passenger coaches being the *locus injuriae* of most casualties in case of wrecks, the writer, at the close of the last session of Congress, introduced a bill to compel common carriers engaged in interstate commerce to strengthen the construction of their cars. By its terms, such cars were required to have strong, heavy underframes, with end and side sills of steel or other metal, and with not less than four girders or sleepers of steel running the entire length of the underframe, including the end platforms. The sills and sleepers were to be covered over with a steel floor of one-fourth-inch plates. The vestibule and framework of the superstructure were also to be made of steel or other metal. The purpose was to require the construction of a car whose floor and upper framework, including vestibules, would have the strength and rigidity of the modern sleeper, without its weight, and which, with girders of steel extending under strongly vestibuled end platforms, would prevent telescoping.

Steel passenger-cars are not unheard of. They have been largely used on the Continent of Europe, steel underframes being in common use. The Illinois Central Railroad Company, after three years of experimenting, has just built at its own shops eight steel passenger-coaches for its suburban service at Chicago. These coaches are giving excellent satisfaction, being of great strength and rigidity, with from six thousand to ten thousand pounds less of weight than cars of equal size of wood construction.* The Monon route has been running on its lines, for some time past, a steel postal-car. To prevent a repetition of the recent Paris Subway horror, the Interborough Rapid Transit Company, of New York, has ordered for its use 200 pressed-steel cars, all the furnishings of which are to be of metal.

* "Railway and Engineering Review," Sept. 5, 1903, page 601.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Steel cars, aside from their uninflammability, have points of advantage over the ordinary type of sleeper in that, with equal if not greater strength, they have less weight, and hence, in case of collision, less momentum; and yet, the degree of safety enjoyed by passengers in sleepers has been remarkable. During the three years prior to September, 1903, in which there were accommodated by the Pullman Company 32,693,341 railway passengers in all parts of the United States, 6 passengers were killed (these casualties occuring in two disastrous railway wrecks in different parts of the country), 4 were seriously and 64 slightly injured.

In reply to this statement, it may be argued that, as sleepers are ordinarily placed in the rear of trains, the force of collision expends itself before they are reached. While this is largely true in butting collisions, the argument avails nothing in rear-end collisions, where the sleeper is first to receive the brunt of impact. As there were, for the twelve months ending March 31st last, only 1,050 butting and 1,882 rear-end collisions, we might expect at least an equal if not greater number of casualties in the latter class of collisions; and yet 320 were killed and 2,792 injured in the butting collisions, while only 205 were killed and 2,063 injured in the rear-end collisions, The fact that the train collided with in rear-end collisions is either stationary or moving in the same direction with the colliding train lessens the force of impact and, therefore, the danger. This fact, added to the greater strength and resisting power of the sleepers in the rear of the train, accounts for the difference in the number of casualties between rear-end and head-on collisions. Moreover, accidents have been reported where the force of a rear-end collision has left the sleepers intact and their occupants uninjured, but transmitted itself through them to the day coaches with crushing and fatal effect.

Objection to steel cars may be made further on the ground that, with no light cars to act as cushions or buffers to deaden the impact, the shock, especially in a butting collision, in coming to a dead stop, would kill or maim more passengers than under present conditions. In the opinion of the "Scientific American," "this point is very much open to question. The passengers would be badly bruised and limbs would be broken, perhaps; but there would be none of the grinding, crushing and tearing of limb from limb that mark the telescoping of two cars."*

* "Scientific American," Feb. 6, 1904, page 117.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The last objection to steel cars on passenger-trains would arise on the ground of their cost. There are at present about thirty-nine thousand passenger-cars in service in the United States, valued at an average of five thousand dollars each, or a total of one hundred and ninety-five million dollars. Once equipped for such work, it is believed that the car-shops of this country could build steel cars for less than nine thousand dollars apiece, the cost of a wooden car. When life and limb are at stake, the question of cost should not receive too much consideration. In view of the fact that the net income of ninety-eight per cent. of the railroad mileage of the United States for the year ending June 30th, 1903, was $734,709,435, of which sum $91,162,712 was surplus and $159,310,010 was paid out in dividends,* an expenditure of two hundred or even three hundred millions of dollars for the construction of steel cars for passenger-trains, extended over a term of five or ten years, would not be unreasonable nor oppressive. The damages paid by railroads of this country for the last ten years, as a result of deaths and injuries received in wrecks, and for litigation arising therefrom, would go a great way toward equipping the roads of the country with such cars.

Steel freight-cars are already being used on many roads because of their greater strength, capacity and safety. Ought not like considerations to justify improvement in cars which carry human freight? It was a pressed-steel freight-car loaded with coal which rammed and crushed a passenger-car near Indianapolis about a year ago, killing 18 and injuring 25 Purdue College students. The freight-car was little injured, the coal not at all.

The railway postal-cars, being placed, as a rule, just behind the locomotive, occupy the position of the greatest danger. As there are over fifteen thousand United States Postal Clerks, these clerks annually furnish their quota, and it is a large one, to the list of railway casualties. The National Association of Postal Clerks has repeatedly appealed for cars having at least steel underframes. Under existing law, the Postmaster-General can prescribe the specifications for the framing of postal-cars; but the specifications which have recently been approved by the Post-Office Department differ but little from the specifications which have been followed for years past. Reform in car construction might well be inaugurated by the Government in requiring here-

* Interstate Commerce Com., 17 Annual Rept., page 108.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

after, in the building of all its mail-cars, the use of steel underframes and steel studding, rafters and carlines in the superstructure. Especially ought this to be the case in view of the fact that the Government annually pays for the use of the car itself, its original cost of construction and, in many instances, more too.

In conclusion, while "the human factor in railroading constitutes the greatest peril," and without the most rigid and unrelaxing discipline the best appliances will not insure absolute safety, nevertheless I strongly urge that wise legislation will materially reduce the number of casualties now so discreditable to American railway management.

Such legislation should have for its object (1) the increase of the inspection force of the Government and the repair and instruction crews of the railroad companies, with increase of powers to Government inspectors; (2) the prevention of excessive hours of continuous labor on the part of railroad employees; (3) the prevention of the employment of youthful or incompetent or inexperienced men; (4) the compulsory installation of the most approved block-signal system; (5) the change of specifications by the Government for all mail-cars from wood to steel; (6) the compulsory use of passenger-cars with steel underframes and steel framework for superstructure and vestibules.

The wise manager anticipates the needs of the travelling public, and, in so doing, increases the patronage of his road. Legislation may not be needed for such as he, but it is needed to whip and spur to action those who lag behind.

JOHN J. ESCH.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE IRISH MUSE.—I.

BY FIONA MACLEOD.

I.

We have in Ross and the Outer Isles a singular legend, which has a beauty within and without. A young crofter was unhappy in love, and not fortunate in the hard way of the hill-life. When bad seasons come on the back of the black wind, the croft-smoke turns from blue to brown, as the saying is: and it was brown smoke from end to end of the Strath, and every one of the scattered clansfolk there had suffered, but none so much as Fergus Dhu, who had lost sheep, and crops, and the youth out of his heart. One day he went idly across the boggy moor under Cnoc Glas, mooning among the black heather where the white tufts of canna were like blown foam of the sea. A single tree grew on that waste, a thorn that on a forgotten Beltane had been withered into a gray lifeless thing. It was called "The Thorn of the Gray Woman," "The Fairy Thorn," and "The Singing Tree" or "The Tree of Bad Music." At many a winter *ceilidh*, by the peat-glow, tales were passed of what had been seen or heard there: but they were all at one in this, that only the happy and fortunate were in peril there, and that only the unhappy and unfortunate might go that way, and, indifferent, see the tall swift woman in gray, or hear the thin music.

Likely, that was why Fergus—Fergus Dhu, as he was called, because of his black hair, and black eyes, and the dark hours into which he so often fell—wandered that day along the sodden bracken-covered sheep-ways. When he came to the Thorn he saw no gray woman, perhaps because there was no room in his mind for any but one woman, who now would never warm to him, but be a kindly stranger always; and heard no thin air, gay or wild, perhaps because the sad lift and fall in his heart was a day-long

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sound that dulled his ears. But while he was staring idly into the withered thorn, he saw a short stem break into little green leaves. He could not believe what his eyes showed him; but, when he saw also pink and white blossoms run in and out among the leaves and break into a fall of snow, and felt the sudden sweetness in the air about him, he believed. He went closer, and his wonder grew when he saw that the stem had seven holes in it. He put his hand on the stem, and it came away. There was a hole at each end, and the thorn-reed was like any *feadan*. So he put it to his mouth, and ran his familiar fingers up and down the holes, for Fergus Dhu was the cunningest player in the Strath. He played till the whole Thorn went into a wave of green. He played till a snow of blossom came all over the boughs, like the whiteness of a running wave over the green of the sea. Although it was November, and wet, and the hill-wind had a moan in it as it searched the corries, it was like a May noon by the Thorn. Fergus looked at the sky, and saw that it was blue: at the long moor, and saw that it was covered with April yellow and with a shimmer of the wings of little birds. He looked at the gray hills to the east, and they were rose-red and a star was above them: he looked at the gray hills to the west, and they were blue as peat-smoke, and a rainbow leaned against them. Then his heart filled with gladness, and he played his joy. As he played, the rainbow leaned away from the gray hills of the west, and took their sadness, and was no more: the star sank behind the gray mountains of the east: the long moor faded into the old silence: the white foam and the green wave ebbed from the Thorn. Fergus looked at the thorn-pipe, and it was only a black, cloud-wet *feadan* with seven mossy holes in it.

He "went away" in that hour. No one saw him that night, or the next day, or the next; and months and years passed, and no one saw him, and his body was never seen, though his bonnet was found near the withered Thorn.

In the seventh year after that, a strange thing happened. A new life quickened the Thorn. A thousand small green buds shook out little fluttering green leaves, and, from these, white moths of blossom continually rose. Linnets sang on the branches.

One day Fergus Dhu came strolling that way. He had no memory of the years that had gone, or with whom he had been, and the sweet fatal accent was out of his ears. But when he saw

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Thorn he remembered his *feadan,* and took it from his coat-fold, and played because of his gladness. The tears fell from his eyes when he saw the gray rain come down and blot out the new life from the Thorn, so that it was old and withered again; and at the wet hill-wind calling again its old mournful cry, wheeling like a tired hawk above the far lamentation of the sheep. "Why is this?" he said. "When I saw this lonely place in its sorrow I played it into joy. And now, when I come upon it in its beauty, I have played it back into the old sorrow. Grief to my heart that it is so"!

One man of the Strath saw Fergus Dhu that day, but people did not know if Donald Mòr, the piper, was sure of his sight; for he had been given too much whiskey at "the big house," and, too, he spoke of Fergus as a thin worn leaf that one sees through when it hangs in the wind. Certainly, no other saw him, nor has seen him since.

This tale of Fergus, who was fey, and went down the west with strangers, came into my mind one day when I had been reading a little in and dreaming over a book wherein reverent and loving hands have gathered, from the hills and hollows and dim shores of Ireland, so much that is beautiful, so much too that, if not of beauty, is sweet and familiar, and overmuch, perhaps, that is of wild, rude, and bitter wayside-growth. For the Gaelic muse seems to me the beautiful and at once sad and joyous spirit of whom poor Fergus was but the troubled image. Does she, too, not go to and fro in a land where rainbows bloom and fade above desolate places; where a star hangs above the holy hills of the east; seeking her desire everywhere, nowhere finding her desire; going in sorrow, but, suddenly beholding the world radiant, breaking into songs of joy and laughter and sweet love; coming again, after an evil time, and finding the gray thorn of the world full of the green leaf, blossom and undying youth, and, so finding, turning suddenly to tears, and to the old sorrow, and to the longing whose thirst is not to be quenched; to the cry of the curlew for the waste, of the heart going a long way from shadow to shadow?

One must know the Gaelic muse in somewise thus, I think. How else can one understand the joy that is so near to sorrow, the sorrow that, like a wave of the sea, can break in a moment into dazzling light and beauty? I have heard often, in effect: "This is no deep heart that in one hour weeps, and in the next laughs."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But I know a deeper heart that in one hour weeps and in the next laughs, so deep that light dies away within it and silence fades into its own still oblivion: the heart of the sea. And there is another heart that is deep, and weeps in one hour and in the next laughs; the heart of the night: where dawns and sunsets are gathered dews, and where darkness that cannot be sounded is as a vast shore strewn with the shining pebbles of the stars. And there is another heart that is deep, and weeps in one hour and in the next laughs: the soul of man: where tears and laughter, sorrow and joy, fear and hope are the fans that blow the rose-white flame of life. And I am well content that the Gaelic heart, that in one hour weeps and in the next laughs, though it be so sad and worn among smiling nations, is in accord with the great spirits of the world, and with immortal things.

But now I must turn to the book over which I have been dreaming, and in which I have read often of late.

In our English speech there is no anthology that has the distinction of finality. Certainly, the best, "The Golden Treasury," does not satisfy all, and for many it lacks the ruder note that is natively dear to us, and the old note of wildness—which is not savagery, or strangeness for strangeness sake, but the remembered accent of the youth of the world—the old note of wildness that is again stealing back into the literatures of many lands, and perhaps into none more than into that of our own, and there, for the chief part as yet, through the listening ear and whispering lips of those who have something of the old Celtic magic in their blood.

It may be that the perfect English anthology, in the limited sense of a lovely final gathering from the poetry of England only, cannot be made till much that England treasures so greatly to-day shall be the dust of a to-morrow that must come. Or it may be that the collection already named, added to in this age or the next with a like care and love, may remain a true witness of a great race, whose finest poetry is, in the main, a passionate flame of the mind, or a still white flame of the known and tangible life, rather than a passionate flame of the soul and of the mysterious, troubled, and unknown and intangible life. It can never be the final anthology for the Scot, remembering his wild ballads and beautiful sad songs; nor for the Welsh people, with their insatiable longing for the hillside and the green wood, but a hill-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

side that is not for climbing only or for shooting across, and a green wood that is not forbidden, and has secret places; nor for the Gael of the Highlands and Isles, who has an ancient music in his ears, and still listens to that, though it is upon the wind now; nor for the Irish, who have the "Rose of the World" for their heart's desire, and their own deeps of magical life, and the unperishing flame of a single great idea, that is at once a memory, a passion and a prayer.

Meanwhile, of the many anthologies, some excel in wise beauty: catholic, as "The Golden Treasury"; more austerely fine, as "The Flower of the Mind"; culled in the nearer fields, as well as on the high familiar slopes, as in "The Oxford Anthology." But all exceed; all temporize beyond the personal "yea" and "nay"; none excludes enough, sufficiently includes. Perhaps the only anthology that can come to us as a new and beautiful thing is an anthology gathered, solely at will, by a poet in love with what he has gone out to seek.

Nothing could appear to us more natural than a satisfying anthology of the poetry of Scotland, than a satisfying anthology of Irish poetry, or of Welsh poetry. There is none. There are treasurable volumes of the Scottish muse, but none that gives us uniquely the breath of Scotland, as the Greek anthology gives us uniquely the breath of Hellas. In art, there is a sunlit slope where life passes into song and fragrance, and where we desire no more, and, indeed, find therein an old and bitter wisdom made honey-sweet. Sometimes the still lips of history unconsciously whisper in the song, sometimes its long tale is concentrated into one breath of the fragrance. So, while we do not say that we find all Hellas in the Greek Anthology, or could find all Scotland in an ideal gathering of Scottish song, we might truly find in each the shaping inward spirit or sense that dwelled in the Hellenic genius or the Scottish genius, and intuitively may know much that is not said, and touch truth in silence, and nourish the mind through the delight of eye and ear. But on this sunlit slope we must not go seeking what is called "knowledge." There is enough of knowledge in the wind, on the hill, in the sea, in the song and its fulfilled music. To this sunlit slope we may go by that old Greek gate. I would we had a like gate for the muses of the West.

I know of no modern anthology which I have taken up with the same eager interest as, a year or two ago, I took up Mr. Yeats's

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Book of Irish Verse"; none ever gave me the like deep and wondering disappointment. It was as the communicable broken echo of an incommunicable passionate voice. The Ireland of one's dreams evaded one continually, and the fleeting glimpses, as in Mangan, made one but wonder the more.

Something akin to this I must say of the "Treasury of Irish Poetry," compiled with so much love and sympathy by two eminent Irish poet-critics, Mr. Stopford A. Brooke and Mr. T. W. Rolleston. It is by far the most satisfactory Irish anthology that has appeared, both as the most representative and as the most carefully and finely chosen. Mr. Stopford Brooke and Mr. Rolleston have enlisted, moreover, for lieutenants, nearly all the foremost Irish writers of to-day—which is sometimes an advantage, and sometimes is no advantage; for the habit of mere appreciation is common, and the gift of critical exposition too apt to be controlled or colored by predilection, while the dual gift of whole understanding and interpretation is rare. If all the critical portion of the book were written with the intellectual width of vision and balance of judgment of Mr. Stopford Brooke in his general Introduction, and of Mr. Rolleston in his appreciation of Mr. Yeats, with the distinction of Mr. Yeats's own brief notices, or with the poetic insight and interpretative charm of Mr. Lionel Johnson in his exposition of Clarence Mangan, this "Treasury" would take unique rank with all students of literature.

But, interesting, often delightful, sometimes fascinating as this book is, it leaves the reader, not with a satisfied sense of art, but with a dissatisfied sense of a high expectation of art unfulfilled. We have the songs and dreams of a nation, and that is good; but, since the days when Ireland renounced its ancient language for the language of an alien and dominant people, it has not achieved greatly, or even highly, in art; and only within a recent period, the period begun by Mangan and Ferguson, has it achieved in beauty what otherwise it has achieved in emotional intensity, in fine or commonplace conventions. To-day, if there is evident as yet no Irish poet of the epical reach and power of Ferguson, no lyrical poet of the ardor and sweep of Mangan, there are new singers who are Irish of the Irish in their passions and sympathies and emotions, but at heart are lovers of spiritual and temporal beauty before all else, and have more or less consciously set themselves to achieve in beauty what in beauty they have

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dreamed—that is, are artists curiously persuading art. It is in this section of "The Treasury of Irish Poetry" one must look for the Ireland woven of dreams, shaped in longing, and divined in the expense of the spirit. It is not a large section, and it is not a great section; but one may see how it will become large enough to enshrine the dreams and hopes and perfected visions of a race in whom poetry is an instinct; and may become great, both in the high sense of the achievement that is above time and change, and in the deep sense of the achievement which companions the soul because it has striven to the beauty of spiritual life and has trusted in spiritual vision. If we seek rather for the beauty that can stand apart from time and country, than for that which must bear the impress of the time and the accent of the country, we shall not in this book find much that satisfies. Almost alone, I think alone, is a poem such as this, where Mr. Yeats is neither Irish nor English, but a poet whose utterance is in English:

"THE ROSE OF THE WORLD.

"Who dreamed that beauty passes like a dream?
For these red lips, with all their mournful pride,
Mournful that no new wonder may betide,
Troy passed away in one high funeral gleam,
And Usna's children died.

"We and the laboring world are passing by:
Amid men's souls, that waver and give place,
Like the pale waters in their wintry race,
Under the passing stars, foam of the sky,
Lives on this lonely face.

"Bow down, archangels, in your dim abode:
Before you were, or any hearts to beat,
Weary and kind one lingered by His seat;
He made the world to be a grassy road
Before her wandering feet."

If this, for many readers, be too remote in thought and expression, let them turn to the same poet's familiar, but ever new and lovely, lyric, "The Lake Isle of Innisfree," or to the simple but deep music of the poem written by one who has loved a beautiful woman, the poem called "When You Are Old":

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"When you are old and gray and full of sleep,
And nodding by the fire, take down this book,
And slowly read, and dream of the soft look
Your eyes had once, and of their shadows deep;

"How many loved your moments of glad grace,
And loved your beauty with love false or true!
But one man loved the pilgrim soul in you,
And loved the sorrows of your changing face.

"And, bending down beside the glowing bars,
Murmur, a little sadly, how love fled
And paced upon the mountains overhead,
And hid his face amid a crown of stars."

It is urged, and not without show of justice in the plea, that so much of the poetry of Mr. Yeats, and of others to be named with him, is not Irish poetry, as we find it in the intense verse of Mangan, or in the light verse of Lever, Moore, and Father Prout, or in the heroic verse of Samuel Ferguson, or in the homely verse and winsome music of Allingham and Alfred Perceval Graves and Jane Barlow, or in the lyrical outcries of the poets of "The Nation," or in the ruder utterance of the unknown singers who bequeathed their crude but unforgettable national ballads in pieces such as "The Wearin' o' the Green," "The Cruiskeen Laun," and "The Shan Van Vocht." The poetry of Mr. Yeats, and others to be named with him, is certainly not distinctively Irish in this sense. But it must not be overlooked that the poetic spirit in every country has two instinctive movements: to become the color and sound of the national life in its outward and particular aspects, and to become the color and sound of the national genius in its inward life and universal appeal. The poet who ignores the accent of time and place is not necessarily the lesser patriot, the less truly nationalist, than the poet who, from the quality of his mind and spirit, or from choice, ignores the accent of the Land of Heart's Desire. Nor can we mistake the universality of the one for that colorless life which is not the universal, but the merely cosmopolitan, note: we cannot really mistake the hidden flower of its mortal life, with its root in time and place and country. If, to the ordinary sense there is no difficulty in recognizing the Irish popular accent in

"She's the most disthressful country that iver yet was seen,
For they're hangin' men and women there for wearin' o' the green,"

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to the trained and poetic sense there is no difficulty in recognizing the Irish spiritual accent in a line such as (to quote from a poem by "A. E."—George Russell—Ireland's most spiritual singer),

"For, sure, the immortal waters run through every wind that blows"—

or Mr. Yeats's

"The immortal desire of immortals we saw in their faces, and sighed"—

or Nora Hopper's

"The world wears on to sundown, and love is lost or won"—

or her

"Rose o' the World, the pain you give
Is worth all days that a man may live"—

or Ferguson's

"For heavy on their senses the faint enchantment lies"—

or John Todhunter's

"O wind, O mighty, melancholy wind,
Blow through me, blow!
Thou blowest forgotten things into my mind,
From long ago."

in a sense, a country lives truly only when it realizes that its sole aim is not to live. Herein is one of the blind distances which separate the Gaelic world of Ireland and Scotland from the English world of Great Britain. The one strives to endure for the sake of being alive; the other endures in order truly to live: and the result is that the spiritual peril of the English nation is the loss of that which owns necessarily a temporal period having a like mortality with the body. Many a peasant on the hillside of Connaught or crofter in the rainy Hebrides—like that Aglaus, the poorest man in Arcady, whom the oracle pronounced happier and more fortunate than Gyges, King of Lydia—has a larger inheritance of life than the wealthy and proud in Dublin or Glasgow, Manchester or London. To live in beauty—which is to put into four words all the dream and spiritual effort of the soul of man—is the real, if unexpressed, aim of a nation become sensitive and spiritual, as to live in comfort and riches is the expressed and accepted aim of a nation become insensitive and material. It is this instinctive realization, far more than nurtured enmity or racial

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

distrust, which underlies the intense and justified nationalism of the finer Gaelic minds of to-day. It is here that there can be no compromise, here that there must be, if the need persist, a fight to the death. The moment that this spiritual nationalism is lost, Ireland is lost, Gaelic Scotland is a dream. The Gael can never become English without losing all that has made him Gaelic. He has so *little* else to lose, alas, that here he can compromise no more. His back is to the rock and to the sea.

In default of a Treasury of Irish Poetry in Gaelic, which to most of us would be an empty music, I wish we could have a Treasury of Gaelic Poetry in English translation. One man could do this excellently, Dr. Douglas Hyde, whose "Love Songs of Connaught" is a book so dear to every lover of the Celtic muse, and selections from which are among the most delightful contents in Mr. Stopford Brooke's and Mr. Rolleston's anthology. Well done, and in a rhythmic prose as nearly literal as practicable rather than in verse (or, if Dr. Hyde were the translator, both in a near prose and a metrical version), a volume such as suggested would indeed be a treasure-trove.

I confess that I made one mistake when I took up the "Treasury of Irish Poetry." That was to read much in it before I read the Introduction to the volume by Mr. Stopford Brooke. The reader should not do likewise. For Mr. Brooke exposes both what were the editorial aims and what are the admitted restrictions of this anthology, and, too accomplished a critic to allow national predilection to control judgment and taste, admits frankly, in effect, that here we have rather the material and promise of great art than great art itself. I think he sums up admirably what so many have variously said, and all concerned do in one way or the other strongly feel, on the question of the linguistic vehicle for Irish thought and Irish emotion and the Irish genius. "England naturally wished to get rid of the Irish tongue and was naturally careless of its literature; Ireland itself, and that was a pity, did not care enough about her own tongue to preserve it as a vehicle for literature; and, finally, her poets and thinkers were steadily driven to use the English language. Much has been lost by this distinction of a literary language, but much has also been gained. If Irish can again be used as a vehicle for literature, so much the better. A few are now making that endeavor, and all intelligent persons will wish them good luck and success. It is no disad-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

vantage to a man or a country to be bilingual, and the teaching and use of the Irish tongue will throw light upon the ancient form of it, enable scholars to understand it better, and increase our knowledge of its treasures. Moreover, there are many realms of imaginative feeling in Ireland which cannot be justly put into poetic form except in the tongue of the country itself. No other vehicle can express them so well. On the other hand, the gain to Irishmen of speaking and writing in English is very great. It enables them to put their national aspirations, and the thoughts and passions which are best expressed in poetry, into a language which is fast becoming universal. It enables them to tell the world of literature of the ancient myths, legends, and stories of Ireland, and to represent them, in a modern dress, by means of a language which is read and understood by millions of folk in every part of the world. These considerations lie at the root of the matter, and if Irish writers do not deviate into an imitation of English literature, but cling close to the spirit of their native land, they will do well for their country when they use the English tongue."

That is wisely put, and great good would come both to the Irish writer and the English critic of Anglo-Gaelic literature if it were adequately understood by each. Each stands in a false position till he sees clearly that "Irish poetry, if it is to be a power in literature, must be as Irish as English poetry is English."

Nowhere in social energy is provincialism so wearisome as in the domain of the mind, and no literary species could be more swiftly fugitive than a Scoto-Gaelic or Irish-Gaelic literature whose central effort was "to be English." I have written elsewhere (and having thought much on the subject, and written carefully out of that thought, naturally been misunderstood and misrepresented by those who have not that habit of the mind which permits intellectual patience) that there can be no English literature but what conforms to the genius of the English language. Nothing can survive that is not of the central stream. The whole effort of art, as an intellectual energy, is to achieve the centre. If Irish or Scottish or Welsh or Canadian or American poets cannot accept the logic of an inevitable law, let them write in Gaelic or the Scots dialect, or in Irish or Welsh, or create a new Canadian or a new American speech. But if they would achieve in beauty in English, they must conform to the tradition of English, to the genius of the English language. When the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mysterious signal is come, all the salmon in the inland streams move towards the sea, to quench in its deep founts their ancestral thirst for the unknown. The wise seek the centre of their sweeping currents, and are borne from the river courses to the vast eternal flood. What of the unwise? Those who escape the common foe of man or bird or otter, their bodies are in the sedges, or they are trapped in a slow death in narrow backwaters, or are caught in pools sunken too far for the most desperate leap.

But to write for the centre—that is, to compel the wisely reluctant genius of a matured language to yield the secret of its power to charm, and to be content with nothing short of this compulsion or with no lesser company than the company of those who have striven and won—is not, in the instance of those we have in mind, the same thing as to *be* English, or to imitate what is English, or to cease to be Irish or Scottish or Welsh. No one can hold with more eager and deep conviction that the Irish writer must be Irish in heart and mind and spirit, and the Highland or Island Gael be Gaelic in heart and mind and spirit, and the Welsh writer be Welsh in heart and mind and spirit. But we have all to write in English, or choose to do so; and, the moment we have made that choice, we have to be on guard against the fatal intellectual provincialism which deprecates the essential and vital genius in the very goal which it is its effort to reach. "The very language is hateful to me," an Irishman whom I know is reported to have exclaimed: but he has no ambition greater than to achieve in that language, whose lesser use is also his bread, and the knowledge of which is his sole means of expression. It were better, I think, to learn some other tongue.

Emerson might have written his essays in Choctaw, or Poe his lyrics in Seminole, or Mr. Yeats his poetry in Sligo Gaelic: but they did not: and the sole concern we have with what they have offered us is as to the quality of the mental or spiritual emotion within the poem or essay, and as to the fashioning in English (their birth-raiment, their life-raiment, and, if so to be, their raiment for immortality) of the "embroidered cloths" in which they have come out to us from the House of the Spirit. If Emerson had not been Emerson, but another, or many masquerading under that name, or if Poe had not been Poe, but another, or many masquerading under that name, they would not be of the centre, but be provincial and forgotten. But the one was a great writer

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and the other a great poet because they were national at the springs of genius; because each was individual in his own eccentric quest and achievement for the rainbow that somewhere awaits every word; and because each was universal in the final expression the one gave to his thought and the other to his emotion, and universal by a ceaseless expense in effort and a constant economy in result in order to achieve that tradition of the centre, English Literature—a tradition as real and imperative for them, writers in English though born of another nation, as for Goldsmith or Swift or Walter Scott. No Irishman could be more truly a nationalist, in the best sense, than Walter Scott was a Scot: but the genius of this provincial squire led him straight to the core of the one speech common to us all, and to the recognition that mastery of it could be attained only by acceptance of the inevitable laws of its central tradition. To this day he is so essentially Scottish that he stands for Scotland, but in his genius he comprises many lands, and utters the supreme and universal tongue which is of no land. In some sort, this must be the ideal of every artist using words as his means of expression, the still words quickened into the shape and color which make living English.

That is why Mr. Stopford Brooke, and every one with the real interest of Anglo-Gaelic literature at heart, lays so imperative insistence on the element of nationality. Those English critics who would see Ireland, Scotland and Wales denationalized, in the domain of letters as in the domain of politics, are foolish as well as unjust, for they do but sap the strong sea-walls built to keep back the floods. English Letters has to-day, with its ever-rising waste of worthless fiction and incompetent comment, enough to do without urging the Celtic contingents to work in the same grooves, and with the same outworn conventions! As for those of us, whether north of the Highland line or west of the Manx Sea, who do not recognize this, or fail in eager and proud observance of this most precious heritage, no more need be said than this, that in ceasing to be national such become provincial only. It is in this sense that London is so overwhelmingly provincial, because it is the centre towards which the provincial mind gravitates and where it finds its most congenial conditions.

FIONA MACLEOD.

(To be Continued.)

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SUICIDE AND LIFE INSURANCE.

BY W. H. LAWTON.

ONE can hardly pick up a newspaper without seeing an item reading somewhat as follows:

"Before Judge Blank and a jury yesterday, John Doe was tried and convicted of arson. According to the evidence, Doe, after taking out $2,000 insurance on a lot of antiquated and unsalable goods, sprinkled the latter with kerosene and set fire to his store. Unfortunately for Doe's plans, the fire was put out before the place was much damaged. The insurance companies did the rest, and Doe will spend a few years working for the State."

Not very long ago, the reader might have seen in the papers a sensational account of the suicide of a millionaire. When his affairs were investigated, it turned out that he was heavily involved, but his creditors would lose nothing because he was insured for over a million dollars.

On reading the first of these items, the average reader would say, "Serve John Doe right"! but, as to the second, he would reflect with calm satisfaction or indifference on the wonderful system of finance by which a man may enjoy life spending other people's money, and at the last leave this world of his own volition contented with the thought that his creditors and family would be amply cared for by the life-insurance companies.

A man who deliberately burns down his own house to secure the insurance is denounced as a swindler, and punished. Public opinion sustains the fire-insurance companies in refusing to pay the loss. The man who obtains a heavy life insurance, and then takes his own life so that his family or estate may benefit by the insurance—what is he? If we are to believe the comments of the general public, as represented in nine-tenths of the newspapers and periodicals, he is more or less of a hero. At most, the rash act

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is attributed to "temporary insanity," and it is a bold company that will risk its popularity by protesting against paying for a risk it did not really assume. The amount involved in the quoted instance has made that case unusually prominent, but it is by no means the only claim of the kind that insurance companies have been called upon to pay during the last few years.

It may be pertinently asked how much the life-insurance companies themselves have had to do with bringing about this situation, by more or less reckless attempts to outbid each other in offering more liberal features in their policies. The time was when no insurance company willingly paid a suicide claim. Self-destruction was looked upon by the company in the same light as destruction of one's own property to recover the insurance. It was regarded as an attempt to swindle the company. But, in the course of time, the courts began to make a distinction between suicides committed with intent to defraud the company, and suicides which resulted from insanity. It became a cynical by-word in insurance offices that every suicide was insane—if he was insured. In fact, one learned judge declared that suicide was *prima facie* evidence of insanity. Hence, it logically followed that an insured suicide was the victim of disease or accident, and the company, of course, was liable. When this principle seemed to be firmly established, the companies sought to protect themselves by clauses in their policies denying liability in case of suicide, "sane or insane"; but, in response to the public sense of fair-play, they generally agreed to refund the "reserve," that part of the premiums paid which had been held for future cost or redemption of the policy. At this point, the vexed question seemed to be fairly settled.

In those days, however, the stress of severe competition was beginning to affect the life-insurance business. One company boldly took the lead in liberalizing the terms of its policies, and agreed to pay suicide claims in full after the third year. In explanation, it was argued that the company's statistics showed the deaths by suicide to be less than one-half of one per cent. of the total deaths from all causes, a proportion so small as to be practically *nil*. The company decided to assume the risk, but with the precaution of a three years' restriction to prevent clearly fraudulent suicides. It was not deemed reasonable to suppose that any man would carry insurance for three years with the intention of committing suicide

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in the fourth. This "incontestable" policy proved very popular with the insuring public, not so much because it gave the insured permission to commit suicide after three years, but because it gave him the assurance that after three years the company would not contest payment of a claim under it for any cause whatever, as long as the premiums were duly paid. Other companies followed suit. One restriction after another was removed, and this course was heralded with loud claims of "the most liberal policy." The time-limit was shortened from three to two years, then to one year, and, finally, a few companies issued policies "incontestable from date of issue." To-day, out of sixty-nine old-line companies of the United States and Canada, there is but one which refuses to accept liability for suicide, though it agrees to refund the "reserve." Five retain the suicide restriction for three years, twenty-nine for two, twenty-six for one, while eight give the insured full permission to blow out his brains or otherwise make away with himself as soon as he has paid the first premium, secure in the knowledge that his family or estate will receive the full amount of the policy from the company!

It cannot be denied, therefore, that the life-insurance companies have by their own act deliberately offered inducement and temptation to suicide. It is quite possible to conceive of a man harassed by debt, facing inevitable bankruptcy, perhaps disgrace, being led to the last desperate act by the knowledge that his insurance policies contain no restrictions on suicide. To a man in this despairing frame of mind, suicide means comfort and even luxury to his family, and the salvation of his financial "honor"! When a man is at such a crisis in his life, it takes very little to move him to commit the crime. Crime? He hardly considers it such. Conventionally, society frowns upon it. Secretly, it frequently approves the act and pities, if it does not applaud, the doer. He does not regard it as a fraud upon the company, for has not the company itself tacitly agreed to consider suicide merely a regular cause of death? Did not the agent glowingly dwell upon the clause "no restrictions after such and such a time"? A suggestion to that man that forgery, or personal use of trust funds, at that critical moment would save him might be repelled with honest indignation. Yet suicide, for the purpose of obtaining the insurance on his life for his family or creditors, is as much a fraud on the company as would be the forgery of its name to a draft.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

No doubt, a great part of the public apathy and indifference to this crime of defrauding insurance companies is due to the prevailing tendency to condone almost any attempt to "beat" a corporation. There is very widespread misconception of what constitutes a life-insurance "company." Few men realize that taking a policy in any company makes the insured a member of that company. No matter whether it was originally organized as a stock company or a mutual concern, a life-insurance company is, to all intents and purposes, a great co-operative society. All its members share, in some form or other, in its profits, and all are equally affected by its losses. But the very size of most of the companies, with their members scattered all over the world, tends to obscure this fact. If we could take one hundred men living in the same town, insure them for $10,000 each, on the same basis as any of the old-line companies, the suicide of one of those men would bring home to the remaining ninety-nine a realizing sense of the fraud perpetrated upon them, as nothing else could. Yet those same men will regard with complacent indifference a suicide loss of a million dollars in a far-off town, because the loss is divided among several hundred thousand members of different companies. In fact, the refusal of any company to pay such a fraudulent claim would be commented upon with indignation. How many of those men would contribute from their own pockets to pay a *pro rata* share of the debts of that suicide? Yet that is exactly what they have done in paying the premiums on their own insurance, and what they will continue to do as long as the companies pay such claims.

What has been the effect upon the companies of these reckless temptations to suicide? Judging from the frequent letters and editorials in life-insurance journals of late, it is quite evident that there has been such an increase in suicide losses as to seriously alarm them. More attention is being paid by medical departments to the "moral hazard." More careful scrutiny into the business affairs of applicants for large amounts is insisted upon. And no wonder! From the almost inappreciable ratio of less than one-half of one per cent., the ratio of suicide losses has increased to three per cent. in one of the largest companies of the United States, an increase of over six hundred per cent. in less than twenty years. On the other hand, some years ago the officers of a great fraternal insurance association, becoming alarmed by the in-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

creasing number of suicide claims, secured the adoption of a by-law refusing payment in such cases, with the result of an immediate and heavy reduction of deaths from suicide.

Manifestly, the time is drawing near when the insurance companies will be forced, in justice to the great majority of their policy-holders, to restore, to a great extent, the restrictions on suicide in their policies. It is high time that this should be done, when, to the familiar joke of "selling out to the fire-insurance company," is added the happy phrase "committing suicide for the benefit of creditors and family."[1] But even then there will be left on the companies' books millions of insurance subject to this latter-day method of fraud. After the companies have done all they can to prevent the alarming increase of suicides, there is still much room for arousing the public conscience to a sense of the wrong to the great body of policy-holders, as well the danger to the body politic, and to encourage social condemnation of it. It was one of the worst symptoms of social degeneracy in ancient Rome that suicide became almost what we would call to-day a fad. Is there danger to the American Republic from that source to-day?

In twelve years there have been over 77,000 suicides recorded in the United States, the number increasing annually from about 3,500 in 1891 to 8,600 in 1903.[2] There were fifty per cent. more suicides in Chicago in 1903 than in 1902. In Philadelphia, for 1902, the official records showed a ratio of 15 suicides per 100,000 of population.[3] But the president of a life-insurance company has stated that, while during fifty years the increase in suicides has averaged 30 to each 1,000,000 persons, the increase of suicides among insured lives has been much greater. He adds that there is little doubt that, when persons are insured under a policy containing a suicide clause, suicidal deaths are often reported as accidental.[4] So, while the restoration of the suicide clause will undoubtedly greatly reduce the proportion of insured suicides, it will not eliminate them entirely. Nevertheless, it is quite apparent

[1] Henry H. Putnam, in "Journal of Insurance Ecomonics" for July, 1904.

[2] Mr. Upton, editor of the "Chicago Tribune," in the "Independent."

[3] "Medical News," of New York, Mch. 7th, 1903, and Sept. 5, 1903, quoted in paper by Dr. John L. Davis, Med. Director of the Union Central Life Ins. Co.

[4] President Fouse of the Fidelity Mutual Life Insurance Co.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that the temptation to suicide is stronger where the inducement of benefiting the family is held out.

It is an easy matter for the companies to put a stop to this insidious form of temptation to suicide, and protect the funds they have collected from honest policy-holders. According to the signs of the times, it will not be a very great while before most of them will do so, by restoring in some form the restrictions of the old suicide clause. There is hesitation in taking the lead, which is due to the fear of losing business in the severe competition that prevails to-day. But there are not wanting also signs that, if the companies do not act, the courts will. It is a far cry from the old days when a court practically threw open the doors to suicide claims by proclaiming that suicide is insanity *per se*, to the doctrine that it is against public policy and welfare to permit any company, no matter what its contract may say, to pay claims that necessarily encourage suicide. Nevertheless, that is the gist of a late court decision, which will undoubtedly be followed by others as cases become more and more flagrant. But it is not wise for the companies to wait for this. Life insurance is primarily based on confidence, and men distrust "law-made" honesty. A company that issues an unrestricted contract, and then shields itself behind the courts, will suffer in the estimation of its policy-holders and the public. But, in the meantime, in all fairness to the companies, an enlightened public opinion should condemn, not condone, the acts of those who would take advantage of the companies' mistaken liberality.

W. H. LAWTON.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT.

BY GEORGE W. E. RUSSELL.

THE Vernons are an ancient and noble race, who came into England with the Conqueror. One of them married an heiress called Venables; his son became Venables-Vernon, and was made Lord Vernon in 1762. This Lord Vernon married Martha Harcourt, granddaughter of Lord Chancellor Harcourt, and heiress of the last Earl Harcourt. The second son of this marriage was the Rev. Edward Venables-Vernon, who was born in 1757, assumed the additional name of Harcourt on succeeding to the estates of his mother's family, was made Bishop of Carlisle in 1791, and Archbishop of York in 1808. This admirable divine had private property to the extent of £10,000 a year: and drew some £40,000 a year from the Church for the space of forty years. He died at the age of ninety; and his character was drawn by the hand of a master in a sketch which is worth reproducing for reasons which will afterwards appear.

"There was a charming kindness and love about him, and simplicity and absence of selfishness. The want was depth—in every way; in intellect, in moral purpose, in sense of responsibility, in concentration of affection. His face quite expressed it; broad, large, yet fine features, nothing gross or low or Rubens-like, but broad and unconcentrated; a man of unbroken prosperity, whom nothing deeply wounded, from whom no crushing would bring out perfume; yet lovable, very, from extreme kindness, simplicity, unaffectedness; chatty, discursive; easily, never deeply, interested; a man to live with, not to die with; for sunshine, not for clouds and storm and dark, dark night; yet quite very lovable."

It was one of the elements of this "unbroken prosperity" that Archbishop Harcourt married Lady Anne Leveson-Gower, daughter of the first Marquess of Stafford—a potentate of the highest renown among the Whigs. And who were the Whigs? and what

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was Whiggery? In answering these questions, let me venture to borrow from myself.

Whiggery, rightly understood, was not a political creed but a social caste. The Whig, like the poet, was born, not made. It was as difficult to become a Whig as to become a Jew. Macaulay was probably the only man who, being born outside the privileged enclosure, ever penetrated to its heart and assimilated its spirit. The Whigs, indeed, as a body, held certain opinions and pursued certain tactics which have been analyzed in chapters XIX. and XXI. of the unexpurgated "Book of Snobs." But those opinions and those tactics were mere accidents, though perhaps inseparable accidents, of Whiggery. Its substance was relationship.

When Lord John Russell formed his first administration, his opponents alleged that it was mainly composed of his cousins, and one of his younger brothers was charged with the impossible task of rebutting the accusation in a public speech. Mr. Beresford-Hope, in one of his novels, made excellent fun of what he called "the sacred circle of the great-grandmotherhood." He showed—what, indeed, the Whigs themselves knew uncommonly well—that from a certain Earl Gower, who flourished in the last century, and was great-great-great-grandfather of the present Duke of Sutherland, are descended all the Levesons, Gowers, Howards, Cavendishes, Grosvenors, Russells and Harcourts, who walk on the face of the earth. Truly a noble and highly favored progeny. "They *are* our superiors," said Thackeray; "and that's the fact. I am not a Whig myself (perhaps it is as unnecessary to say so as to say I'm not King Pippin in a golden coach, or King Hudson, or Miss Burdett-Coutts). I'm not a Whig; but oh, how I should like to be one!"

By this illustrious alliance the Archbishop became the father of fourteen Vernon-Harcourts. A lady who married one of them used to say that a Wild Boar, which is the crest of the Vernons, and a Peacock, which is the crest of the Harcourts, were the two most appropriate emblems of her husband's family which could be found in the whole heraldic menagerie. And, indeed, if the Boar symbolizes a rugged disregard of other's feelings, and the Peacock an ostentatious satisfaction with one's own performances, the appropriateness of the badges has not been decreased by lapse of time.

Archbishop Harcourt, like the good Christian that he was,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

realized that charity begins at home, and was careful to avoid the censure which the Apostle passes on him who fails to provide for those of his own house. He flourished in the great days of the Anglican Establishment; before the Ecclesiastical Commission had laid its levelling hand on Episcopal incomes, and when an Archbishop's patronage, ecclesiastical and secular, was practically unbounded. Accordingly, all the Vernon-Harcourts were enriched; and among them was the Rev. William Vernon-Harcourt, Canon of York and Rector of the lucrative living of Bolton Percy; who became in 1827, father of William George Granville Venables-Vernon-Harcourt.

The subject of our present study was, therefore, what the Scotch call "a son of the manse." He believed that the happiest days of his life were those which he had passed in the holy privacy of a country parsonage. When Arthur Pendennis gushed over the "long, calm evenings" in the country, George Warrington brutally rejoined: "Devilish long, and a great deal too calm. I've tried 'em!" And Sir William Harcourt "tried 'em" for some eighteen years; for this gentle child of a pastoral home was never subjected to the brutalizing influences of a public school.

It argues no blind faith in a strange system of unnatural restraints and scarcely more reasonable indulgences, to hold that the training of a public school is the best adapted to the common run of Englishmen. "It made us what we were, sir," said Major Bagstock to Mr. Dombey; "we were iron, sir, and it forged us." The average English boy being what he is by nature—"a soaring human boy," as Mr. Chadband called him—a public school simply makes him more so. It confirms alike his characteristic faults and his peculiar virtues, and turns him out, after five or six years, that altogether lovely and gracious product—the Average Englishman. This may be readily conceded; but, after all, the pleasantness of the world as a place of residence, and the growing good of the human race, do not depend exclusively on the Average Englishman; and something may be said for the system of training which has produced, not only all famous foreigners (for they, of course, are a negligible quantity), but such exceptional Englishmen as William Pitt and Thomas Macaulay, and John Keble and Samuel Wilberforce and William Harcourt.

All these famous men went from home to the University; and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in his nineteenth year Mr. W. V. Harcourt became a member of Trinity College, Cambridge. There were giants in those days; and it should always be remembered, to the credit of his powers and his industry, that in 1851 he was placed eighth in the First Class of the Classical Tripos; J. B. Lightfoot, afterwards Bishop of Durham, being Senior Classic.

Immediately after taking his degree, Mr. Vernon-Harcourt came up to London, and entered on a double career of journalism and law.

In 1852 he published anonymously two letters on "The Morality of Public Men," which criticised, in imitation of "Junius," the attempt of the Conservative Government to revive protection. These letters did just what they were intended to do. They did not frighten Lord Derby, nor bring a blush to Mr. Disraeli's hardened cheek. They did not materially contribute to the victory of free trade; but they served an even more important end—they got their author talked about. And what can an ambitious youth desire more? The Whigs made much of their young recruit. He became the oracle of Strawberry Hill, and the spoilt child of Devonshire House. His social talents were soon recognized, and he grew to be a diner-out of established vogue. Meanwhile he was acquiring a good practice at the Parliamentary Bar, where in those days connection and address were more esteemed than legal learning; and his leisure moments were occupied in that rather savage sort of anonymous criticism which was then the stock-in-trade of the "Saturday Review."

In 1859 he made his first attempt to enter Parliament, standing in the Liberal interest for the borough of Kirkcaldy. "We are all the victims of circumstances, and I the greatest," exclaimed Mr. Pickwick in his agony, when Mrs. Bardell accused him of breach of promise of marriage. And Mr. Vernon-Harcourt might well have said the same, for his defeat was, in great part, due to the fury of a novelist who lived in the neighborhood, and who believed, quite erroneously, that the Liberal candidate was the Saturday Reviewer who had scarified his latest novel.

Balked in his Parliamentary ambitions, Mr. Vernon-Harcourt applied himself with redoubled vigor to the bar. He took International Law under his special protection; and, during the American Civil War, he poured himself forth in the "Times" over the signature "Historicus," with such good effect that, a few

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

years later, he was made Professor of International Law by his own University of Cambridge.

At the General Election of 1868, his great chance arrived. He was returned to Parliament for the City of Oxford; and immediately became an active, able, and rather factious member of the advanced section of the Liberal party. For his official leaders he showed scant respect, and even Mr. Gladstone's towering personality failed to strike him with awe. Just before the downfall of Mr. Gladstone's first administration, he took office as Solicitor-General, and, when it was represented to him that loyalty to leaders was expected in those who have "taken the shilling," he replied that he had only "taken the sixpenny bit." From this it will be rightly inferred that Sir William Harcourt (as he now was) thought highly of himself and his deservings; and an opportunity soon arrived for forcing himself into greater prominence, and at the same time chastising the leader who had offered the sixpenny bit where the shilling was due.

At the beginning of 1874, a General Election took place. The Liberals were beaten, Mr. Disraeli (soon to become Lord Beaconsfield) became Prime Minister with a great majority, and Mr. Gladstone announced his impending retirement from the Liberal Leadership. Sir William Harcourt was not the man to waste his time in unavailing homage to defeated heroes. He was by profound conviction a worshipper of the rising sun and Mr. Disraeli became the subject of his almost oppressive adoration. Archbishop Tait brought in a "Public Worship Regulation Bill," the object of which, abruptly stated by Mr. Disraeli, was "to put down Ritualism." Seeing that it promised to be popular, the Government adopted the bill, and afforded facilities for its consideration. Mr. Gladstone, who had retired to the undisturbed enjoyment of hymnology and Homer, scented the battle from afar, rushed up to London from Hawarden, and offered the bill a strenuous and almost single-handed opposition. The most entertaining passages of arms took place between him and Sir William Harcourt, who had so lately been his Solicitor-General. Sir William had espoused the bill with extraordinary ardor, and, when the House of Lords dealt rather cavalierly with some amendments of the Commons, he implored Mr. Disraeli to take up the cudgels, and expressed his confidence in him in dithyrambic terms:

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"We have a leader of this House who is proud of the House of Commons, and of whom the House of Commons is proud. Well may the Prime Minister be proud of the House of Commons, for it was the scene of his early triumphs, and it is still the arena of his later and well-earned glory. . . . We may well leave the vindication of the reputation of this famous assembly to one who will well know how to defend its credit and its dignity against the ill-advised railing of a rash and rancorous tongue."

A provision had been introduced into the bill which would have overthrown the Bishop's right of veto on proceedings against Ritualists, and would have invested the Archbishop with power to institute suits, or allow them to be instituted, in a diocese not his own. This provision Mr. Gladstone vehemently opposed, on the ground that it was contrary to the whole tradition and structure of the Church, and that it was fundamentally inconsistent with the custom of Christendom as regards the relations between Metropolitans and their suffragans. In support of this view he quoted at large from the canonist Van Espen. Sir William Harcourt poured scorn on these citations; was proud to say he had never heard of Van Espen; pooh-poohed all canonists and casuists; adopted Mr. Bright's famous phrase about ecclesiastical rubbish; took the broad and manly ground of common sense, common law, and the Constitution and accused Mr. Gladstone of having come back to wreck the bill at the eleventh hour. Five days afterwards Sir William resumed his discourse. He had got up the case in the mean time, and met Mr. Gladstone on his own ground. He argued the question of canon law. He cited Ayliffe's "*Parergon Juris Canonici Anglicani,*" and Burn's "Ecclesiastical Law," and sought to show that the power claimed for the Metropolitan was as sound canonically as constitutionally. This unexpected display of erudition gave Mr. Gladstone an opportunity, which he was not slow to use.

He rebuked "the honorable and learned gentleman" for having given one of the most conspicuous and most objectionable examples he had ever known of the vicious practice of discussing speeches delivered in the Lords. And then, referring to Sir William's canonical exercitations, he said:

"I confess, fairly, I greatly admire the manner in which he has used his time since Friday night. On Friday night, as he says, he was taken by surprise. The lawyer was taken by surprise, and so was the Professor

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of Law in the University of Cambridge; the lawyer was taken by surprise, and, in consequence, he had nothing to deliver to the House except a series of propositions on which I will not comment. I greatly respect the order, and the spirit of the order, of the House, which renders it irregular, as, in my opinion, it is highly inconvenient, especially when there is no practical issue, to revive the details and particulars of a former debate. Finding that he has delivered to the House most extraordinary propositions of law and history that will not bear a moment's examination, my honorable and learned friend has had the opportunity of spending four or five days in better informing himself upon the subject, and he is in a position to come down to this House, and for an hour and a half to display and develop the erudition he has thus rapidly and cleverly acquired. Human nature could not possibly resist such a temptation, and my honorable and learned friend has succumbed to it. . . .

"There is one thing against which this House cannot too much protest —that whenever a man is opposed to you, you should fix upon him a bad name. That is my honorable and learned friend's frequent course. . . . My honorable and learned friend is still in his parliamentary youth: he has not as yet sowed his political wild oats. When he has done so, I have not the smallest doubt that all these great powers which he has developed, and which no one can see in development and exhibition with greater satisfaction than myself, will be found combined with a degree of temper, and wisdom, and consideration for the feelings of others, and with a degree of care in stating the arguments of opponents, that will make him outshine and eclipse them in his eloquence and, if he have opportunity, in his knowledge of Metropolitan Visitation. . . . The main reason why I never will, without necessity, follow my honorable and learned friend into these roads of controversy is this, that I am quite convinced—and let my words be marked—that it is well for this House to consider whether it does or does not desire to maintain a national Establishment of religion in this country. If it is desired to maintain that national Establishment of religion, then I say that moderation in act and temper and mildness of language are absolutely necessary in those who undertake to guide the House on these difficult and perilous questions. But if the tone and the language and the temper of my honorable and learned friend are to be taken as the standard which is in future to govern us in ecclesiastical discussions, I say that, whoever is wrong or whoever is right, there is one result that will override us and pass by us; and that is that the national Establishment of religion will give way under the strokes that will be dealt to it by its most ill-advised defenders."

Thus ended this rather unequal duel and from that time forward Sir William Harcourt never attempted to cross swords with his former chief. On the subject of Ritualism he kept silence, yea even from good words, though it was pain and grief

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

unto him, until Mr. Gladstone was safely laid in Westminster Abbey.

At the period which we have now reached, close observers of Sir William detected in him some signs of an intention to quit the Liberal party, which was disorganized and feeble, and to attach himself to the conquering standard of Lord Beaconsfield. But the Tory chief had read the "Legend of Montrose," and apparently regarded these overtures much as Lord Menteith regarded those of Major Dugald Dalgetty: "I had scarce patience with the hired gladiator, and yet could hardly help laughing at the extremity of his impudence."

The services which one general rejected, another was glad enough to accept; and this stout soldier of fortune became the sworn adherent of Lord Hartington, now Duke of Devonshire, and then leader of the Liberal party. But soon a new danger threatened. The "Bulgarian Atrocities" of the Turkish Government in 1876 again drew Mr. Gladstone from his retirement. He flung himself into the agitation against Turkey with a zeal which in his prime he had never excelled, if indeed he had ever equalled it. He displayed a versatility, a courage, and a resourcefulness which raised the enthusiasm of his followers to the highest pitch, and filled his guilty and baffled antagonists with a rage akin to frenzy. Lord Hartington, whose mind moved more slowly and uttered itself more cautiously, soon found himself pushed aside from his position of titular command. Though there was a section of the Whigs who doggedly supported Turkey, it soon became evident that, both in the House and in the country, the fervor, the faith, the militant and victorious element in the Liberal party were sworn to Mr. Gladstone's standard. It was just two years since he had resigned the leadership of the party, and he was again its dominating and inspiring influence.

Now this turn of events was by no means agreeable to Sir William Harcourt. The sentiments which he then entertained towards his former chief had been put beyond the pale of doubt by the indiscreet publication of some private correspondence. It was, indeed, highly desirable that Lord Beaconsfield should be dethroned, but supremely undesirable that Mr. Gladstone should reign in his stead. Many and various were the devices designed to avert that catastrophe. Nothing was said: prudence and the memory of the debate on the Public Worship Regulation Bill

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

forbade it. But much was whispered. Mr. Gladstone was wild, incalculable, irresponsible. He was a fanatic. He was a ritualist. His campaign in Midlothian had cost the party fifty seats. He had retired finally from official life. He had offended the Queen. His health would never stand the burden of a second Premiership; if he took office at all it must be in some subordinate capacity under Lord Hartington. This sweet intrigue, industriously promoted by anonymous writers in the press, went merrily on till Easter, 1880, when Parliament was dissolved, and at the General Election Lord Beaconsfield was beaten by 100. Under these circumstances, no course was constitutionally open to the Queen except to send for Lord Hartington, who was still the titular leader of the Liberal party. If I am correctly informed, Sir William Harcourt was the most strenuous of all the counsellors who urged Lord Hartington to accept the Premiership. But Lord Hartington knew better. Having ascertained that Mr. Gladstone would not serve under him, and naturally shrinking from the prospect of having his former chief as a candid friend and independent critic of his administration, he declined the Queen's commission, and Mr. Gladstone became Prime Minister for the second time. He made Sir William Harcourt his Home Secretary; and it is but bare justice to say that Sir William, having accepted this new service, threw himself into it with his accustomed vigor.

Having rather late in life come out as a Gladstonian Liberal, he blacked himself all over for the part. For the next five years, Sir William was a prominent and valuable member of Mr. Gladstone's administration. His most notable achievement was the Irish Crimes Act of 1882, which, courageously administered by Lord Spencer and Sir George Trevelyan, brought the murderers of Lord Frederick Cavendish to the gallows, and stamped out political crime in Ireland. In the summer of 1885 the Liberals were turned out of office; and the General Election of the ensuing autumn left them still in opposition. The Tories had obtained and kept office by a close alliance with the Parnellite members, and Sir William Harcourt indulged in characteristic pleasantries about his opponents "stewing in Parnellite juice," when, lo! on the 17th of December, 1885, it was announced that Mr. Gladstone had become a Home-Ruler. The Parnellites joined their forces to his and gave him a majority in the House

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of Commons. On the 1st of February, 1886, he became Prime Minister for the third time, Sir William Harcourt consenting to be stewed in Parnellite juice and serving under him as Chancellor of the Exchequer. For the next six years, the versatile actor was destined to play another new and very unfamiliar part, and to stand before the astonished world as the Protagonist of Home Rule. In August, 1892, these uncongenial toils were duly rewarded. The General Election had again replaced Mr. Gladstone in power, and with him Sir William Harcourt, who was again Chancellor of the Exchequer. The interior life of Mr. Gladstone's last Cabinet was not that of a happy family. The Wild Boar ravaged the vineyard, and the Peacock uttered discordant cries. As Christian, Countess of Devonshire, wrote to her nephew in 1653: "Where you are of the Choir, there can be no harmony in the Musick." It was known that Mr. Gladstone had taken office only in order to pass the Home Rule Bill through the Commons; and, that task accomplished, he was ready and eager to depart. Who was to succeed him? The Queen's choice seemed practically restricted to two men. In the House of Lords, the leader was a man young as politicians go; clever, judicious, adroit; who had never neglected an opportunity of gaining a friend, and would compass sea and land to make one proselyte, and add even the humblest unit to his personal following. In the House of Commons the leader was a man twenty years older; quite as clever; infinitely better informed; a parliamentarian of unequalled resources; who had never opened his mouth without making an enemy; had trampled on every one who came near him; and under whom no self-respecting colleague could consent to serve. So Lord Rosebery became Prime Minister; and Sir William Harcourt, in spite of high abilities, great achievements, and substantial virtues, missed the supreme prize of public life, because he had never learnt to keep a civil tongue in his head.

Though disappointed of the Premiership, Sir William still contrived to bulk largely in the public eye. As leader of the House of Commons, he controlled the legislative business of Parliament, and he was determined that the session of 1894 should be wholly his. He devoted it to a really great and striking Budget, which did much towards redressing the inequalities of taxation, and placed a proper share of the burden of Empire on

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the landowners and the brewers. In piloting this measure through the House of Commons, Sir William, who had always been known as a very clever man, displayed new and unsuspected gifts. He obtained complete mastery over the complicated details of our fiscal system; and, whereas his public speaking had up to that time been the mechanical delivery of carefully written orations, he now developed the much higher power of quick, easy, and dexterous debating.

In the other performance to which, during the Parliament of 1892-5, Sir William Harcourt addressed himself, he was less successful. In his younger days of political independence, he had been a stout opponent of interference with the Liquor Traffic. Indeed, some elephantine jest of his about "grandmotherly legislation" had been adopted by the champions of Unrestricted Beer as their motto and watchword. But here again, as lightly as Dugald Dalgetty passed from the service of the King of Spain to that of the States of Holland, Sir William transferred his sword to the Army of Local Veto; and his blind zeal for the new flag caused his own rejection and the ruin of his party, at the General Election of 1895. After that monumental defeat, he tried for a while to lead the disheartened and disorganized forces of the Opposition; but his heart soon failed him and he disappeared into private life.

Disappeared—but only for a season; for, lo! yet another flag and another cause soon claimed his sword; or, rather, having exhausted all the possibilities of fresh service, he reverted to the standard of 1874, and burst upon the world again as the Champion of No-Popery.

Theological controversy had a peculiar fascination for Sir William Harcourt. It afforded him unequalled opportunities for indulging his special gifts. It enabled him to wound other people in their most sensitive points; and to do so with perfect impunity, as those whom he attacked were bound by their sacred calling to abstain from reprisals. His assaults upon the Ritualistic Clergy of England were in the highest degree ungenerous and indecent. And yet the offender was not wholly without excuse. The mere spectacle of devotion irritated worldliness. Self-sacrifice was a standing reproach to self-seeking. The very sight of men who live for an unpopular cause stings the Soldier of Fortune into a fury which he cannot, if he would, dissemble.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Sir William belonged to the old and exhausted School of Irreligious Liberalism. I mean no reproach to his private character. Like Mr. Squeers, he could justly boast of being "the right shop for morals"; but he belonged to a political school which honestly believed that Religion was the greatest mischief which could befall the individual or the State. "Destroy the Establishment! Why, it's the only thing that stands between us and Religion," cried one prophet of this school. "Things have come to a pretty pass," said another, "when Religion is allowed to invade the sphere of private life." To politicians of this type, Mr. Gladstone's ardent spirituality was an irritating puzzle; and his passionate insistence on the Christian Dogma as a guide of political action filled them with indignation and alarm. But he was indispensable, and they knew it; and so, with rage and grief in their hearts, they bowed to his yoke and followed his leadership; and, as long as Mr. Gladstone remained at the head of the Liberal party, Religion was safe from Liberal attack.

Another excuse for Sir William Harcourt's wrath against "Ritualism" (if one must borrow the nickname of current controversy) is that Ritualism stands for the spiritual independence of the Church, while Sir William was "the last of the Erastians."

"If," wrote Mr. Gladstone in 1876, "we follow the Erastian idea, it does not matter what God we worship, or how we worship Him, provided we derive both belief and worship from the civil ruler, or hold them subject to his orders. Many most respectable persons have been, or have thought themselves to be, Erastians; but the system, in the developments of which it is capable, is among the most debased ever known to man."

Of those "most respectable persons" Sir William Harcourt lived to be the sole survivor; and his performances a few years ago in the Anti-Ritualistic Crusade were the expression of a passionate desire to crush the spiritual life of the English Church, by binding her, in spite of her struggles and protestations, to the chariot-wheels of the English State. It was a criminal and hopeless enterprise, as indeed Sir William, if only he had ears to hear, might have learnt from his old friend and patron Lord Beaconsfield. "The principle that forms Free Kirks is a strong principle, and takes many forms, which the social Polyphemes, who have only one eye, cannot perceive."

In writing this paper I have been on my guard against treating

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

my subject in a spirit of unqualified eulogy, but I should not satisfy my own sense of justice if I left, as the final impression on my reader's mind, that very unattractive aspect of Sir William Harcourt's character which he displayed in theological disputation. I would now place the picture in other and more becoming lights.

The description of Archbishop Harcourt which I transcribed at the beginning contains not a few elements of resemblance to his grandson. Indeed, when Sir William lectured the recalcitrant clergy, I always felt that atavism is responsible for much, in that, being an Archbishop's grandson, he could not see a curate go astray, without an instinctive desire to punish him. It would be insidious to indicate the special qualities in which Sir William most closely resembled his grandfather, or those in which the resemblance was less distinct. Physically, the resemblance was almost a reproduction; and morally there were many points of similitude.

Even in respect of temper, Sir William's bark was worse than his bite; or, if I may use again the heraldic metaphor which has helped us so often, his grunt was worse than his tusk. In spite of all that has come and gone, and without retraction of anything that I have written, I affirm that he was fundamentally affectionate, generous and humane. He had a generous zeal for Peace, Freedom and Temperance. About his cleverness and his accomplishments there can be no two opinions. He was thoroughly well read, and his general culture rested on a broad and firm foundation of classical scholarship. He had the "Corpus Poetarum" and Shakespeare and Pope at his fingers' ends, and his acquaintance with the political history of England elicited a characteristic compliment from Lord Beaconsfield. It was his favorite boast that, in all his tastes, sentiments, and mental habits, he belonged to the eighteenth century, which he glorified as the golden age of reason, patriotism and liberal learning. This self-estimate strikes me as perfectly sound, and it requires a very slight effort of the imagination to conceive this well-born young Templar wielding his doughty pen in the Bangorian Controversy, or declaiming on the hustings for Wilkes and Liberty; bandying witticisms with Sheridan, and capping Latin verses with Charles Fox; or helping to rule England as a member of that "Venetian Oligarchy" on which Lord Beaconsfield lavished

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

all the vials of his sarcasm. In truth, it is not fanciful to say that whatever was best in the eighteenth century—its robust common sense, its racy humor, its thorough and unaffected learning, its ceremonious courtesy for great occasions, its jolly self-abandonment in social intercourse—was exhibited in the demeanor and conversation of Sir William Harcourt. He was an admirable host, and, to borrow a phrase from Sydney Smith, "received his friends with that honest joy which warms more than dinner or wine." As a guest, he was a splendid acquisition, always ready to amuse and to be amused, delighting in the rapid cut-and-thrust of personal banter, and bringing out of his treasure things new and old for the amusement and benefit of a later and less instructed generation.

Some of Sir William's quotations are so extraordinarily apt that they deserve a permanent place in the annals of table-talk. That fine old country gentleman, the late Sir Rainald Knightley, who was the living double of Dickens's Sir Leicester Dedlock, had been expatiating after dinner on the undoubted glories of his famous pedigree. The company was getting a little restive under the recitation, when Sir William was heard to say, in an appreciative aside: "This reminds me of Addison's evening hymn—

> 'And Knightley to the listening earth
> Repeats the story of his birth.'"

Surely, the force of apt citation can no further go. When Lord Tennyson chanced to say in Sir William's hearing that his pipe after breakfast was the most enjoyable of the day, Sir William softly murmured the Tennysonian line:

> "The earliest pipe of half-awakened birds."

Some historians say that he substituted "bards" for "birds," and the reception accorded by the poet to the parody was not as cordial as its excellence deserved.

GEORGE W. E. RUSSELL.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE SELF-SUPPORTING STUDENT IN AMERICAN COLLEGES.

BY PROFESSOR ORLANDO F. LEWIS, OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MAINE.

THERE are in most American colleges three kinds of students: those who earn none of their college expenses, those who earn some and those who earn all. The proportion of non-self-supporting students is large, but large are also the numbers of the self-supporting men and women; indeed, self-support is one of the most prominent features of the American college life of to-day. It is also a most elusive subject upon which to gather information, and the following statistics and opinions concerning various phases of the subject are, in general, only the willing but frankly subjective estimates of American college presidents or their representatives.

The term "self-supporting" designates in this article both those who earn all their college expenses and those who earn only a part. The article will endeavor to treat of the self-supporting student as a "sub-freshman" or prospective collegian, of the expenses that loom up before him, of his opportunities as an undergraduate for work at the college and in the vicinity, of his earnings, his scholarship and his social standing in the college community. He is a large factor, numerically and economically, in the college world; and indeed it may be seriously asked if the typical "college man" might not be represented more truthfully by the self-supporting student than by the much more familiar hero of the college tales, illustrated weeklies and athletic fields.

Sixty college presidents or their representatives have responded to a request to furnish the statistical information given below. Several large educational divisions of the United States are fairly well represented. The North Atlantic Division is represented by 22 colleges; the South Atlantic Division by 3 colleges; the South Central Division by 4 colleges; the North Central Division by 25 colleges; and the Western Division by 6 colleges.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A regrettable absence of answers from Southern colleges makes much desirable information unavailable concerning a section of our country particularly interesting in its relation to the self-supporting white student.

"Going to college" has never been more popular than at present. The "World Almanac" for 1904 gives a total attendance of 119,496 students in our universities and colleges at the close of the college year of 1901-1902. This fall's "largest entering classes" were especially numerous; great endowments, new and mighty buildings, the development of professional schools, the newspaper interest in educational and athletic matters, and the widespread impression in our schools that college gives the best preparation for the work of life, have centered more strongly than ever the eyes of the preparatory school student upon the goal of a college education. To most students the college course seems a necessary luxury. Parents make heroic efforts to put the child through college, and the students themselves, when it is necessary, join the self-supporting army to wage, as Yale puts it, a "four years' warfare" for the four years' course.

It is difficult to estimate how many students are deterred by financial reasons from undertaking a college course. Twenty-nine colleges out of 60 do not know, or give no answer; of those replying more definitely, 19 believe many preparatory-school students would go to college if they could afford to, while 12 colleges think the number but few. And, indeed, the student who is trying to decide if he can make college expenses and earnings meet might receive "self-help" pamphlets from a score of colleges, and rise from their perusal with no definite impression save a headache. Bates College "sees no reason why a healthy, vigorous student should hesitate for financial reasons to enter"; Wesleyan University believes that "any person in good health can go through college if he will," and similar reports come from Harvard, Cornell, Ohio State University and the University of South Dakota, the president of which writes that he knows of students leaving the University for financial reasons who dressed better than he did.

But St. Lawrence University "could double its attendance in six weeks if it could assure all persons that they could earn their way without interference to their studies." Yet the University of Minnesota states that "self-supporting students are invariably

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

able, through the kindness of instructors if necessary, to arrange some satisfactory programme." Western Reserve University prints that, with term-time earnings and vacation opportunities, any thrifty and enterprising young man can pay his way through college. Later, in the same pamphlet, however, one who has "been through the mill" says he would not advise a boy to endeavor to earn all his college expenses, save in cases of exceptional ability in skilled work.

The fact seems to be that the exceptional self-supporting student can earn his way, as do, on an average, 25 men in each class of the Yale academical department; but most students must drop out or borrow money, as do half the students of St. Lawrence University, who fail from lack of funds to complete their college course, or those men in the University of Pennsylvania whose effort to earn money exhausts practically all their time and strength. College presidents agree that pluck, endurance and an absence of false pride are necessary, and President Thwing, of Western Reserve, says frankly that the self-supporting student must have an amount of pluck and worthy self-confidence that most men do not possess.

Two additional opinions are noteworthy. Denison University thinks that 50 per cent. of those wishing to attend college are deterred by financial *excuses*, but only 2 per cent. by financial *reasons*. Marietta College believes that many stay away from college, not because they feel they cannot make their way, but because they are unwilling to lose the time that might be devoted to business and the acquisition of financial independence.

So the tide of self-supporting students continues to flow toward the colleges, and the needy freshman finds plenty of company. From Maine to California the self-supporting students form a respectable and much-respected army. In only 4 out of 59 colleges are they estimated as falling below 10 per cent. of the total enrolment, namely, at the Universities of the South, Cincinnati, Missouri and Utah. But in Colby College, Illinois College and Baker University 90 per cent. of the students are believed to be working, wholly or partly, their way through college. Bates College and Rutgers College report 80 per cent. or over, and Dartmouth and the Universities of Vermont, Minnesota and Kansas 70 per cent. or more. Two colleges report between 60 and 70 per cent.; 11 colleges between 50 and 60 per cent.; 3 between 40

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and 50 per cent.; and 9 again between 30 and 40 per cent. Harvard reports the number to be very large; the Universities of Illinois, Michigan and Wisconsin have no data on hand; the University of Chicago gives over 50 per cent. Yale and the University of Pennsylvania report between 10 and 20 per cent., and Cornell University about 25 per cent.

The figures vary generally, not according to the location of the colleges, but by individual institutions. Two colleges, for instance, in Kansas report 70 and 90 per cent. respectively, and the other 35 per cent. Missouri reports 7 per cent. and Minnesota 70. By great divisions of the country, we find that the average for the 22 North Atlantic colleges is 48 per cent., for the 3 South Atlantic colleges 50 per cent., for the 4 South Central colleges only 18 per cent. The North Central Division with its 25 colleges reaches an average of 45 per cent., and the Western Division falls to 25. For 52 colleges, the percentage is 45; the 18 State universities have an average of 34, and the 34 other colleges an average of 47.

As has been stated, these figures are based upon opinions of colleges rather than upon data at their disposal. Comparatively few colleges have made careful attempts to discover the proportion of self-supporting students in their midst, although, as will be indicated later, the colleges are endeavoring more and more to meet the demands for work rising from the student army of the unemployed. Consequently, it is quite possible that an average of 45 per cent. of self-supporting students, or 53,773 in a total enrolment of 119,496, may be proved later not representative; but it is also true that the average may be either larger or smaller. The college head often cannot tell what the college hands are doing. Students are reticent about their private affairs, and, as one correspondent phrased it, the college president sees many things only through a telescope.

It is equally difficult for the prospective college student to estimate what his necessary and incidental expenses are likely to be, for not only do college expenses vary more or less according to size and location of the institution, but the estimated "low," "medium" and "high" annual expenses published in most college catalogues vary not only in what is included as necessary (tuition, registration, laboratory, gymnasium, library and other fees, board, room, etc.), but also somewhat in the degree in which they include

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

such other expenses as clothing, amusements, athletics, laundry, travelling, social dues, etc. So it may happen that the "necessary minimum expenses" of $105 at one college may be higher because of what is omitted than the statement of another college of $186.47. Nor can the freshman tell definitely from his neighbors' experiences. The University of California has published an exhaustive and illuminating statistical expense account of each of 76 students, prepared by the students themselves; but the total annual expenses range in this collection from $100 to about $450. Yet they are declared to represent not "average," but "low," college expenditures.

Averaging the "low" expense estimates of 58 colleges, we have $216; the "medium" estimates of 41 colleges, $340; and the "liberal" estimates of 50 colleges give us $471. It is very probable that the figures upon which the "low" average is based are sufficiently close to the really necessary expenses to make the result of some value as an approximate "national" average. "Medium" and "liberal" estimates are of course more variable. The average "low" expenses of 24 State universities are $170; of 39 other colleges, $242; the difference in favor of the State universities may be explained partly by their low or free tuition, and by the lower cost of living in the Central and Western States where the State universities are most prominent and strongest. College expenses in the East average considerably higher than elsewhere. In the North Atlantic Division 22 colleges give as a "low" average $279, 3 South Atlantic colleges $184, 4 South Central colleges $173; while 24 colleges in the North Central Division average "low" $182, and 6 Western colleges, $167.

The problem, then, before the self-supporting student is, approximately, how to earn at least $200 from September to September. He finds at the college offices only a limited amount of "work," and scores of applicants among the students. This labor problem is a constant source of anxious perplexity to the president and his secretary, or the committee on self-help. The college can, to be sure, employ a few students as janitors, bell-ringers, farm-hands, caretakers on the college grounds, and for ordinary carpentry and mechanical work. Students can act as waiters and dish-washers at the college and fraternity eating-houses; they can be proctors, monitors, theme-correctors, assistants in the laboratories, library and gymnasium; at the college

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

offices clerical work to a limited amount is frequently offered. But all that the college can directly offer in its own service would be but a morsel for the appetite of such a student-body as that of the University of Minnesota, for instance, with its 70 per cent. of self-supporting students. A few college presidents have unsuccessfully experimented with college woodyards, spool and chair-leg factories, etc. But the pay for college work is rarely over 20 cents an hour.

So the colleges have, in increasing numbers, done the next-best thing in instituting free "self-help" agencies, appointment bureaus on the general plan of the teachers' agencies. The student announces that he desires work, and the college bureau seeks it and recommends the student. Harvard, Yale, Columbia, Pennsylvania, Tufts, Maine, Brown, Chicago, Tulane and California are but a few of the colleges thus acting as unpaid middlemen. In this work the college branches of the Y. M. C. A. lend ever-increasing and valuable service, a general secretary being located at many of the larger universities, who, frequently at the expense of the college, canvasses the college town and neighborhood for opportunities for student employment.

The kinds of work done by students, though not unlimited in extent, are practically endless in variety. Dean Hurlburt of Harvard says that it is far easier to enumerate the things students do not do than to tell the ways in which they earn their money. The writer of this article is strongly tempted to dwell at length upon these "student industries," as offering most picturesque and suggestive commentaries upon college life; but reference can be made, fortunately, to several excellent articles treating this romantic side of the question of self-support,* and to the self-help publications of California, Chicago, Western Reserve, Columbia, Yale, Maine, Denison, Minnesota and Wesleyan.

It will be apparent upon the slightest reference to these pamphlets that the college student is not afraid to "tackle" as varied occupations as are listed in a city directory. His ingenuity, frankness, pertinacity and cheerfulness are his great stock in trade. He earns from a dollar to a thousand. He enters college with $300, and goes to his summer work with a cash balance of 30 cents; or

* "Working One's Way Through College" (two articles), by Alice K. Fallows, *Century*, vol. 44; "Through Harvard on Fifty Cents," Garrison Williams, *Saturday Evening Post*, January 13, 1900; and "How Modern College Students Work Their Way," Forrest Crissey, *Saturday Evening Post*, June 6, 1903.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

he appears in September with a debt of $10 and comes into Commencement week with $25 to start him out on his summer canvassing. He does everything all the year round in all sorts of ways.

His occupations can be classed, in a rough way, as skilled and unskilled. He takes care of furnaces and lawns, houses and gardens, and receives a room and perhaps a part or all of his board; waiting on tables or washing dishes nets him from a part to all of his food. By manual labor, one Chicago student earned last year all his expenses, including tuition. A young fellow at Columbia drove a truck on Saturdays, while waiting for something better to turn up, and came to the end of the year with $350. Only a small proportion of the college expenses, however, can generally be earned at the unskilled rate of 15 to 25 cents per hour.

Between skilled and unskilled labor are found many student occupations. Students organize boarding clubs, collect bills, canvass, deliver newspapers, light street-lamps, and act at college as agents for a thousand different things. As a tourist-guide one Columbia man earned $275 in a season; a student at Minnesota paid his way through college by driving a laundry-cart twelve hours a week. A half-dozen Yale men have acted as a company of pall-bearers, and Wesleyan men have made a market for farm produce from home.

Skilled labor is remunerative. The student gravitates most readily toward tutoring; its fees are never less than 50 cents an hour, and often rise to several dollars. Columbia reports several students as thus earning in a season $850 apiece. Seventy-one students of Yale earned by tutoring in 1902-1903 a total of $8,652, an average of nearly $122. A successful life-insurance canvasser at Pennsylvania earned all his college expenses, his commissions during nine months amounting to $3,000. Lecturing, preaching, managing playgrounds and recreation centres, teaching in night-schools, newspaper reporting, clerking, running stereopticons, coaching small boys in studies and games, stenography and typewriting—such are a few of the many occupations of fairly large earning power. The general secretary of the Brown Y. M. C. A. quotes preaching as "earning from $1 to $10 per week; teaching from $1 to $3 per night (20 weeks per year, 3 to 5 evenings per week); clerking, from $3 to $5 per week, afternoons and one evening; tutoring, from 50 cents to $2 per hour; and typewriting 40 cents per hour."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The average amount earned by self-supporting students is problematical. More is earned in city colleges than in institutions in small towns; but the lower college and living expenses offset in some measure the difference. Statistics from Columbia show the earnings of 273 students, in term time during the academic year of 1902-1903, to have aggregated $39,435.57, making the average earnings of each student $144.45. When this sum is added to $163.54, the average earnings of each of 192 students during the vacation of 1903, we have some light upon what the average self-supporting student can do in one city college; his earnings are $308, about $150 less than the estimated "low" annual expenses of Columbia.

Student occupations in vacation time are even more varied than term-time "jobs," for in the summer the student is hampered by neither location nor recitation hours. Vacation is literally the student's time for making hay. He turns up everywhere, selling stereoscopic views at the Vermont side-door, harvesting in the Kansas wheat-fields, managing a summer stage-line running into the Yosemite, cooking for a Minnesota lumber-camp, setting type for a Pennsylvania county weekly. He registers you at the hotel desk, shows you to your room, seats you at the dining-table, checks your baggage, sells you your ticket, and takes in his various capacities your tip, all for the cause of education. He surveys the railroad you are travelling upon, calls out the stations, and shovels the fuel into the engine. And he travels considerably more than the majority of his college professors.

The self-supporting student must evidently exercise considerable skill in adjusting his hours of recitations and his hours of labor, that both may be carried without failure. It is an open question how much the self-supporting students are hampered by their outside work. Not all college executives state the case so strongly as does the president of St. Lawrence University, who believes it to be "simply impossible for a student to work all the time or a considerable portion of it and do good work at his studies." Bates says that "students engaged in outside work must be methodical to a degree requiring unusual decision and energy." On the other hand, Cornell University thinks that in the majority of cases the student's college work does not suffer, because the time spent in labor is taken from time otherwise devoted to idleness, pleasure or recreation; a view held also by Dickinson and Minnesota. South

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Dakota believes the student can do well, if only he has earned something during the summer.

But only 3 colleges out of 59 believe that self-support is no hindrance to college work. Fifty report that outside work is somewhat hampering, or that it is a hindrance, although only 2 colleges seem to consider it seriously detrimental. A student, as at Harvard, may have to choose between competition for a possible scholarship, meaning consequent total attention to class-room work, and an actual opportunity to earn money, that means, however, renunciation of college financial aid. Not all outside work hampers the student; tutoring, assistance given in laboratory or library, night-school teaching and similar occupations are excellent training for the college man. The extremes are well indicated in two students, one of whom, at California, works several hours daily on a delivery wagon of a clothes-cleaning firm, taking the time absolutely from college work, while the other student, in post-graduate work at Chicago, stated recently to the writer that he had earned the previous season over $2,000 at tutoring in the vicinity of the University.

It takes indomitable grit to earn one's way through college, and, as Beloit puts it, entire self-support is advisable only in exceptional cases. But for him who is ready for the fight, there is encouragement in the possibility of applying to other college centres the words of Mr. R. A. Myers, secretary of the Columbia University Committee on the Employment of Students, that "a good man almost always finds employment," and that "the resources for earning money in New York city are almost unlimited, and have as yet hardly been tapped." Yet the majority of wholly self-supporting students probably find it necessary to "drop out for a year" once or twice during the college course, to earn as a motorman, machinist, book-agent, or in some other of a hundred trades, sufficient money to complete the college course. And many students do not hesitate to follow in their senior years the advice of several universities to borrow money, to be paid back as soon after graduation as possible.

Concerning the scholarship of self-supporting students, the opinions expressed are very favorable. Of 60 colleges, only 3 rate the class-room work of the laboring student as lower than that of his financially more secure colleague. On the other hand, 17 colleges believe in the higher scholarship of the self-supporting

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

student, and 26 other institutions state that there is at least no difference in the average rank of the two classes of students. Ten colleges "could not tell," and 4 returned no answer. It is, then, apparently, safe to assume that, although the self-supporting student may be so hampered in his work as to drop out of college sooner or later, the college generally suffers nothing by his presence, but rather gains from the standpoint of its average scholarship.

There are exceptions, of course, in both classes of students, but it is gratifying to notice the frequency of such replies as that of Yale, that 15 of the 19 highest appointments fell, in the class of 1903, to self-supporting students, although in each case they were only about 15 per cent. of their class in the graduating body from the several schools of the University. "This showing," the report continues, "is undoubtedly higher than annual averages would continue to be, but it is safe to say that the scholarship of self-supporting students is higher than that of the others."

At Columbia, Mr. Myers chose recently in alphabetical order the latest college records of 51 students that had applied for work to the Committee on the Employment of Students, and of 51 that had not so applied. Only the limited time at his disposal made impossible a comparison of the complete registration of the college. "The figures," Mr. Myers reports, "certainly give the palm to those working their way through college, and such action is probably just. But, on the other hand, I find that the sterling, wholly responsible *man* is about as hard to find among those working their way as elsewhere." And it is then suggested that all final comparisons of self-supporting and non-self-supporting students should be deferred until twenty years after their graduation.

Lehigh says, very simply, that "self-support does not affect scholarship at all. If a student devotes too much time to outside work his scholarship suffers. On the other hand, a poor student naturally has fewer diversions than a well-to-do student, and so is apt to study harder." Cornell finds, not in the self-supporting student, but in the independent student with a small allowance, the man with the highest average. So it seems evident that scholarship in general does not suffer from the effects of self-support. As Tufts puts it, "the self-supporting students have a higher sense of their responsibilities," and Dartmouth believes that the systematic work of the working students and their appreciа-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion of an education is conducive to faithful work. The self-supporting collegian may not be able to stand the pace, but he is a good pace-maker while he lasts.

That the American college is a democratic institution, in which worth counts more than wealth, is the sentiment of many replies to the question as to the social standing of the self-supporting student. Not only are the working boys accorded college honors, but class distinction and fraternity fellowship are offered with a most satisfactory readiness to the self-supporting students. Of 59 colleges, 47 report "no difference" in social standing. Dean Hurlburt, in answering from Harvard, voices admirably the sentiment strongly expressed by many other colleges.

"At Harvard there is absolutely no difference between rich and poor, so far as social standing goes. Sometimes a man has to devote himself so closely to his studies that he has no time to take part in the social life of his class, and is known to a few only; but I believe that a man makes of himself what he wants, except when he starts out to obtain social recognition. Usually, a man of this sort fails. The thing that counts here is to be a worker in some one thing, and a man may win distinction in any way he pleases. To be taken into one of the undergraduate clubs a man must be 'clubable,' and if he is this the men ask nothing more. I have known men who have paid every cent of their way taken into societies which those in the undergraduate world who value society life think the most desirable, and men of the greatest wealth who wanted club life, but who were uncongenial, left out. . . . The part of college life I wonder most at and most admire as the years go on is its splendid democracy."

The University of California adds this word: "Any difference in social standing would arise from early training, disposition, personality, habits, tastes, and amount of time and money available for mingling in the interests and pursuits of other students. Of course, the man who is 'hard up' financially may be 'hard up' too in early training, manners and adaptability." Leland Stanford states pertinently that it depends entirely upon the class that forms the judgment.

It is hardly to be expected that the situation is the same in all colleges; there will always be students who are not thoroughly convinced of the dignity of labor. Ten of the colleges report a "slight" difference in the attitude of mind toward the self-supporting student, the Southern colleges being rather more inclined apparently to feel a distinction. Mercer University reports:

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Self-supporting students are valued by their fellows in all college matters, except possibly as regards their eligibility for fraternity membership, simply upon their individual merits. In the question of eligibility for membership in some of the fraternities and of standing socially among the ladies who are interested in college matters (we have not coeducation), ready money has its effect as elsewhere in life."

At the other extreme stands the reply from Baker University, that "the students here consider that there is a little premium upon the man or woman who works. Hence some of our students who financially do not need to work take on, nevertheless, a little labor." And at Wabash the self-supporting students are the leaders in all the student organizations. So the almost unanimous verdict of college executives as to "no difference" may be taken with the grain of salt that flavors the letters from Harvard, California, Mercer and Baker, without in the least questioning the undoubtedly vigorous presence of that "splendid democracy" in the American college student-body that is so proudly written and read in the letters just quoted.

There are many phases of the life of the self-supporting students that for reasons of space must remain untreated in this article. The health of working students, the topographical relation of their homes to their colleges, their careers after graduation would be fruitful subjects of investigation. And no study of self-support in American colleges can be complete without attention to the whole subject of the financial aid extended by the colleges in the form of scholarships, gratuities and loans. Since such aid, however, has many of the characteristics of a gift, it has been only barely touched upon in this article, which has aimed to consider the student wholly from the side of his work and its results upon his college life.

Until further statistics materially alter the results obtained from the above-mentioned statements of college executives, it may be said of the self-supporting American student that he and his fellows are going to college in large numbers, and constitute nearly one-half of the entire college student-body of the United States. It is difficult to estimate how many more students would go to college, did they feel that they could earn their college expenses; for those who undertake the "four-years' warfare" the annual expenses can be hardly less than $200. The college itself can offer to the student comparatively few opportunities for work

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

within its walls and boundaries, but the self-help bureau will try to find work for him that, if industriously pursued, will bring him in from $100 to $150 between September and June. This sum, added to what he can earn during the summer, should meet about two-thirds of his college expenses. His college work will be somewhat hampered by his outside labor, but if he gives to learning his lessons the same energy he devotes to earning money, his scholarship will be fully as good as the average. His social standing will not be impaired by his self-support, unless the time put upon his outside work causes him to neglect ordinary social duties and opportunities. His four years of college life may have to be extended through five from lack of funds, but if he has pluck and seriousness he can win the battle. He can count upon having the respect of president, faculty, and students, and in his hours of hard work he can console himself with the thought that his enforced labor is very probably developing within him the qualities of pluck, endurance and thoughtfulness that later on in life will stand him in excellent stead.

ORLANDO F. LEWIS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ALIEN COLONIES AND THE CHILDREN'S COURT.

BY ERNEST K. COULTER, DEPUTY CLERK OF NEW YORK'S CHILDREN'S COURT.

THERE is probably no place where the social, physical and moral effects of the further congestion of our already overcrowded tenement districts, with the enormous and miscellaneous influx of aliens, is more immediately apparent than in New York's Children's Court. Here daily looms up, in a manner most startling, the menace of the congested immigrant colonies to our future citizenship. The army of children burglars, pickpockets and thieves, the multitude charged with less serious offences, the children without proper guardianship, come from these colonies. Practically all of the material brought into the Children's Court for remoulding is a gift from Europe. By the use of means in which there is a large measure of reason and humanity, the saving of the great majority of these children is being accomplished. But the burden that Europe is shifting to us through the steerage is daily becoming more onerous. The fact that there are thousands of children accused of crime to be dealt with is due almost altogether to the evil moral and physical conditions following the massing of immigrants in narrow districts. With the disintegration of the alien colonies in our great cities, and with the enactment of wiser immigration laws, the number of juvenile offenders would be so small that there would scarcely be need for Children's Courts. Simple, too, would be the problem of municipal charities.

A study of nationalities, just completed, shows that eighty-six per cent. of all the children arraigned in the Children's Court, which has jurisdiction over the old city of New York (Boroughs of Manhattan and the Bronx), were born either abroad or of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

parents born in foreign countries. For our cosmopolitan metropolis this percentage may not be so striking, but the significant fact is that practically all crime among children comes from the same congested living-spots. These are the breeding-places of the great majority not only of the inmates of our reformatories, but of our charitable institutions.

The moral and physical standards of the hundreds of thousands of aliens being added to our population each year, as the Commissioner-General of Immigration himself gives warning, are falling. The flood is not from the more desirable sources, but from those where there are the greatest illiteracy and the worst living conditions. Virtually one million aliens came to this country last year. Of the 857,046 persons who came in the steerage, during the fiscal year ending on the 30th of June, 1903, more than two-thirds were from Italy, Russia and Austria-Hungary. More than one-fourth of all the arrivals could neither read nor write. This immigration is colonizing in our cities, and, worse than that, in very narrow districts in our cities. The arraignments in the Children's Court speak most forcibly as to the results in New York.

Not only is the present immigration of a much lower order, morally and intellectually, than that of the past, but in colonizing in the cities the aliens are building barriers about their settlements which are not easily penetrated by American ideas of well-being and citizenship. In these colonies they are peoples unto themselves.

The Italian knows of either the Mulberry, Mott or Bleecker Street, or "Little Italy," colonies long before he leaves his native land, and he heads for one of these directly on leaving the Barge Office. More than 250,000 of the immigrants who came to this country last year have remained in New York; and to-day most of this number will be found in the foreign colonies between the Battery and the Harlem.

In a single square mile, bounded on the west by the Bowery, on the east by Mangin Street, on the north by East Houston Street and on the south by Cherry Street, there is a Jewish population alone of 350,000.* There are 675,000 Jews in the city of

* For this information the writer is indebted to Dr. David Blaustein, Superintendent of the Educational Alliance, under whose direction a religious census of that district has just been completed.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

New York, but the vast majority of the Jewish children who are arrested come from that square mile of congested humanity. So scarce is house room there that a dozen synagogues in that district are forced on the Jewish Sabbath to worship in the rear rooms of saloons, the clatter of the bars sounding in the ears of the congregations. Between 50,000 and 75,000 Jews live in the Borough of the Bronx, but rarely is a Jewish boy brought to the Children's Court from that Borough. The tenements in which they dwell there were built after laws had been enacted which prohibited the erection of rookeries such as are now the homes of nearly all of the population of the lower East Side. There is plenty of room in the Borough of the Bronx, and there children grow up in healthy freedom. Light and air are the most powerful enemies of crime.

The names of 7,647 children appeared on the Children's Court calendar in the year which ended December 31st last. More than half of these children were born in Italy or Russia, or of parents born in those countries. The offences charged ran nearly the entire gamut of the Penal Code. Birth is the fundamental test of citizenship in this country; but, in investigating the subject of immigration and juvenile crime, it is as important that the nativity of the parents be known as that of the child. The parents are responsible for the child's environment, and the environment determines whether or not the child shall start in the path to vagrancy and criminality. Is it reasonable to expect that those children who are taken into the crowded spots that are already the breeding-places of depravity and disease will have a healthy growth?

Russia leads in furnishing work for the Children's Court, with Italy a close second. Of all the children arraigned, more than twenty-six per cent. are of Russian parents. More than ninety-eight per cent. of these children of Russian parents come from the lower East Side, a vast majority, as has already been said, coming from that square mile of territory where the religious census showed that 350,000 Jews lived. It is not long since the Russian Jewish parent enjoyed the reputation of striving always to do the best that he could do for the moral as well as the physical good of his family. Their love of home was proverbial. To-day, however, with the lower order of immigration that is crowding into the Ghetto, a laxity is appearing in the moral standards set by the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

parents for the children. This laxity or apathy on the part of the parents has become so apparent that the Hebrew charitable workers who visit the Children's Court view the situation with alarm. Only a few years ago, it was a remarkable fact that there were no Hebrew criminals. So small was the number of delinquent Hebrew children that it was thought it would never be necessary to build a special reformatory for them. There were Catholic and Protestant institutions for the treatment of delinquents, but the suggestion of a Jewish reformatory would have been resented. To-day the number of convictions of Hebrew children is so large that Hebrew philanthropists have subscribed a large sum of money for a protectory.

The effects of the oppression and carefully fostered ignorance in the native country are at once apparent in the Russian immigrants on their arrival here. The Russian arrivals cling to the cities; and, crippled by poverty and ignorance, as they are, what place is there for them but the slum and sweat-shop districts?

The parents have lived so long in subjection that timidity and endless patience under hardship are second nature. Too often, too, on their arrival here, both father and mother, in the fierce struggle for existence, are breadwinners. They work early and late in the sweat-shops or in their miserable tenement rooms, while their children grow up in the streets. No matter how abject the condition of the father may have been in Russia, there, at least, he was czar in his own household. But here his children find a new freedom. They learn our language much more rapidly than their parents, quickly adapt themselves to the new surroundings, bad as they are, and soon outstrip their elders. They feel a superiority to their parents, and this often comes to amount almost to contempt. So engrossed, too, are the parents in their struggle to gather in a few dollars that they do not view this slipping away from their control with the same concern as formerly.

Larceny is the common charge against the Russian children arrested. From their ranks come some of the most skilful pickpockets in the city of New York. Seldom or never is a child of Russian parents arrested for a crime of violence. But in these children the pickpocket bosses, commonly called "Fagins," find their most apt pupils. The methods by which these boys are worked into the pickpocket squads are so insidious that the boys are frequently transformed into thieves before they realize that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

they have done wrong. The first lesson is usually profitable and apparently guileless. The Fagin, after winning the boy's friendship as a good-natured and liberal fellow, one day in the boy's sight drops a twenty-five-cent piece into a pocket. He then tells the boy that he may have the coin if he takes it from the pocket without being detected. The instructor is conveniently blind for four lessons. The boy has had and squandered a dollar, wealth he never before dreamed of coming into his possession. A new life has been opened up to him, but all unknown to his parents; Fagin has managed that. Soon the boy is working with the squad playing "stool to a dip," that is, he crowds while one of the other boys goes through the pedestrian's pockets or extracts the contents of a chatelaine bag. The good-natured friend by this time has become a tyrant, and rules by threats and violence. He takes ninety per cent. of the boy's pickings. Next the boy is convicted of grand larceny in the Children's Court. Fagin's dollar has been a paying investment.

Although the Italian population of New York is estimated at less than 400,000, twenty-four per cent. of all the children arraigned in the Children's Court are of Italian parents. All of these Italian children come from within the purlieus of the distinctive Italian colonies down-town, or from "Little Italy," the cities within the city, with their sunless courts, malodorous streets and fire-escapes crowded with food and clothing. About one-half of the Italian children arraigned have been born in Italy. This, of itself, tells something of the character of our present immigration. The fact that there are children to be taken along is not much of a deterrent in the rush for the United States. The children are bundled along like the packs that contain the family chattels.

The thirty dollars which the father has shown to the immigration inspectors, to enable him to get beyond Ellis Island, has frequently been borrowed from a fellow passenger, and is repaid before our new resident and prospective citizen has passed the gates of the Barge Office. The family goes into a miserable room in a tenement that is already crowded to suffocation with men, women and children. Until the father gets work, the family often subsists on the charity of relatives and friends. To many of these parents, the chief concern about their children is that they should help in the breadwinning, and the boys are let out as helpers to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

bootblacks whose stands are blocks away; or, as soon as they learn how to make change, they are sent to sell papers. Their new companions of the dark stairways and busy streets teach the new arrivals how to evade the truant officers. If the boy is placed in school, it is more than likely that, after hours, he is running wild with the "gang," which exists in practically every tenement block, and whose daring leader has had more or less experience with the police. The new recruit to the "gang" is taught at the outset that the "cop" is his worst enemy. His first actual criminal experience is when he is detailed "to lay cheese it"—that is, to stand picket while his companions pry the hasp off a basement door. The parents, handicapped, as they are, by ignorance of our language, customs and laws, do not realize the dangers to which their children are exposed.

Then, too, there is a large element among the Italians who seek to have their children committed to public institutions, that they may thus be relieved of the burden of their support while they are being educated. If the city is going to insist on Giuseppe attending school, and his earning-power is thus going to be cut off or, at least, greatly diminished, his parents too often are anxious to have him committed. To them, sending a boy to a charitable or reformatory institution is sending him to "college." The colony knows all about the "college." In fact, the fame of the American "college" has spread over all of Southern Italy; and many of the parents are told before they leave for this country that they will find here institutions where their children will be educated, taught a trade, fed, clothed, and lodged all at public expense. A father or mother who has had a child committed to one of these charitable or reformatory institutions, regardless of the complaint, is often looked upon with envy by neighbors. This does not apply, of course, to all the parents in the colony; but, unfortunately, it is the attitude that is all too prevalent. Many a child has unwittingly told in the Children's Court of the collusion by which his parents hoped to have him "put away" where he would learn a trade.

Instances are many where parents have even charged their children with theft, in the hope that they would be committed. In a recent case, all parties concerned artlessly told the Court that the boy had been brought to this country only three weeks before, solely for this purpose. The justices, who in turn preside in the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

court, are thoroughly familiar with all these tricks, and they have found a remedy. The law has been so amended, at their suggestion, that they may now, at their discretion, place the father of any child committed to an institution under an order to pay for the child's maintenance while there. It costs the city two dollars a week for each child sent to an institution because of improper guardianship or destitution, and $110 a year for each child committed for reformation. When a father, who is the complainant against his own boy or girl, is told that in event of commitment an order will be entered against him to pay the city for the child's maintenance, his charges frequently melt away, and under renewed questionings the culprit becomes a jewel. The amendment of the law has done much to cut down the number of "disorderly child" complaints.

The resourcefulness of some of the parents in the Italian colonies is best illustrated, perhaps, by the experience of an examiner in the Bureau of Dependent Children, who was investigating a case of alleged destitution. A wretchedly-clad woman, with a seven-months-old child in her arms, called at the Bureau recently, with a story of poverty and a husband at home dying of consumption. Her husband had but one leg, and for many weeks before the consumption developed had been without work. The mother said that, if the Department of Charities would take the child, she would seek employment, and probably be able in a few days to give her husband such food as he required. The examiner hurried down into Oliver Street. He found the consumptive in a dingy room at the top of five flights of tenement stairs. The room had been stripped of everything save the bed in which the consumptive lay, its scanty covers, and a wooden leg underneath it. The woman who had accompanied the examiner told, with a flood of tears, how everything had been pawned; they were just about to send the leg to the shop around the corner. The man was barely able to make himself understood. He had lost his leg, he said, in a blasting accident; later, the consumption had developed. That he was in the last stages of the disease, there was no doubt. But the examiner marvelled at the combination of misfortunes. He lifted the bed-covers—two legs were revealed. The consumptive had hired out his services to the parents of the child whose commitment was sought, the wooden leg had accommodatingly been loaned by a professional mendicant, who lived

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in the next block. The city's charity had originally supplied the leg to its owner, but, for business reasons, he wore it only on Sundays or when he was taking a vacation. The father, who had planned all these elaborate arrangements to shift the care of his child on to the city, was at work and earning twelve dollars a week.

There are many recruits to the Italian colonies who come to this country with the intention of remaining only long enough to accumulate a few hundred dollars, a fortune to them. With this they can go back to Italy and live out the rest of their days in what to them is comfort. It is in this process of accumulating their "fortune" that it is of great assistance to them if they can rid themselves while here of the expense of maintaining their children. Parents of this class have no regrets when their children are arrested. Let it be said, however, that there are thousands of Italian parents in these colonies who are intelligent and affectionate, as well as thrifty, and who rear their children with care. But with this class the authorities have little to do.

The small number of arraignments of children of parents from the Austro-Hungarian Empire is a forcible argument for the disintegration of the foreign colonies in our cities. Austria-Hungary is the second largest source of immigration to this country, the steerage arrivals of 206,011 last year falling little below the number from Italy. The percentage of children of Austro-Hungarian parentage arraigned in the Children's Court is barely eleven. The explanation of this small showing is that there are practically no distinctive Austro-Hungarian colonies in New York. There is no common language to cement these people together in a strange land. With their thirty languages they scatter on arriving here, and are quickly absorbed into widely separated districts, where often they find only a few who speak their tongue. Those who speak German seek out the German districts; the Bohemians disappear into the small Slavonic colonies, as do the Poles. The Dalmatians are swallowed up among the Greeks and Italians. Because of this scattering and the fact that the number is comparatively small of those who go into the colonies which respond least readily to American influences, the children of Austria-Hungary give the authorities little trouble.

There has been a heavy falling off of both Irish and German immigration in recent years. This is to be regretted, for past ex-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

perience has shown that that immigration is of a desirable class. The percentage of arraignments of children of Irish parents, however, is about ten. Only 8.07 per cent. of all the children arraigned are of German parents. Great Britain, and this includes Canada and the British West Indies, gives a percentage of only three, while France has a percentage of less than one.

The percentage of children arraigned whose parents were born in the United States is 13.66. This includes the negroes, whose percentage of the total arraignments is 3.86. The percentage, then, of white children brought into court whose parents are known to have been born in the United States is 9.80. A large portion of these come from the densely populated "Hell's Kitchen" district. In fact, four per cent. of all the children arraigned in the Children's Court come from that small section on the West Side. In a number of cases, 2.27 per cent. of the arraignments, the children had been born in this country, but the nativity of the parents could not be ascertained. Little more than one per cent. of the children arraigned were of parents from countries other than those which have been named.

From the standpoint of the Children's Court, and with the welfare of city children in view, there is no more important municipal problem to-day than the distribution of arriving immigrants to the less densely populated sections of the city. With the powerful influences of the steamship companies at work at Washington against immigration legislation, Congress is slow to give relief. In the mean time, our future citizenship is in peril.

Recommendations have been made for measures to encourage arriving aliens to move on to the open places of the West. However attractive this proposed solution of the problem may sound, the fact confronts us that the aliens do, and will continue to, cling to the cities. Crops may go to waste for lack of harvesters, but there will always be thousands clamoring for places in sweatshops and for peddlers' licenses. The foreigners are in the cities and there they are likely to remain.

With further building of parks and widening of streets, more light and air will be let into the dense, alien colonies, and thousands will be forced into the outlying districts, where the new building laws compel the erection of more wholesome dwelling-places. The aliens will not leave the old colonies until driven to it. The fifty or seventy-five thousand Jews who have

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

moved into the Bronx, with resulting benefit to themselves and their children, have gone there of necessity. The East Side Ghetto could not hold them. Months had passed without a single "to-let" sign having been seen in the windows of its tenements.

The task of the authorities in combating the evils of congestion has been and will continue to be an arduous one; the inertia of ignorance and sloth is always hard to overcome. Not the least among the factors potent in this work will be the Children's Court. There, crime and poverty, ignorance and neglect, on the one side, and the law, humanity, charity and reason, on the other, are daily in conflict, with a resulting flood of light on city conditions, and the saving of many children.

ERNEST K. COULTER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE AUSTRALIAN TELEGRAPH SYSTEM.

BY HUGH H. LUSK.

THE people of Australia own their own telegraph system, and it is managed as a part of the postal system of the country. This arose in the beginning from the fact that, when telegraphs were first constructed, no private company would have taken the risk of making telegraphic communication pay a dividend on the capital required to construct and work the lines. As in the case of the railroads, the choice lay between telegraphs constructed and managed by the Government, and no telegraphs at all; and the people of Australia adopted a system of Government ownership. Each of the five colonies into which the great island-continent was divided began the construction of telegraph lines, and pushed them forward as fast as the spread of population appeared likely to make any return on the outlay. Australia has always been a wealthy country, and especially so since the gold discoveries of half a century ago, and it has always had a tendency to be lavish rather than niggardly in all matters of public expenditure. This tendency has been illustrated in its telegraph system as much perhaps as anywhere. Lines were made, and afterwards extended, in districts where the demand seemed to be small, and where the population was certainly scanty, to an extent which would not have commended itself to the business instincts of a great corporation, and could not have been expected to yield a large return on the capital invested. The result has been that Australia, more than any other country in the world, presents a field for investigating the effects that may be expected to flow from the public ownership of a great public convenience like the telegraph system of to-day.

The whole question was brought into prominence by the debates that took place in the Federal Parliament, in con-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nection with the passage of the new Postal Act of the Commonwealth. In each of the colonies—now the States of the federation—the telegraph had always been treated as a part of the post-office system; and, therefore, when the Federal Constitution was framed, it was agreed, as a matter of course, that the lines should go to the Commonwealth instead of remaining the property of the States, like the railroads. The fact that the colonies had been wholly distinct had led to considerable differences both in administration and in charges, and the purpose of the new Postal Act was to establish uniform rates throughout the Commonwealth on a scale that should at once be liberal to the users and fair to the revenue. It was natural, therefore, that the whole question of cost, management and charges should be thoroughly ventilated in the debates on the measure before it became law.

The circumstances of Australia, and the conditions of its settlement, have had the effect of making both its railroads and its telegraphs unusually extensive in comparison with the numbers of its population, and this is markedly the case with its mileage of telegraph lines. At present, the great island is only settled on a strip of country bordering on the coast, and even that strip does not include the more northern shores either on the East or West, and takes in no part of the north side at all. The consequence is that a line of telegraph which connects the settlements of Queensland on the northeast of Australia with those of West Australia on the west coast—a distance, in a direct line, of about two thousand five hundred miles—covers fully double that distance from the necessity of keeping in touch with the settled districts. There is, indeed, one line of telegraph which of necessity ignores this rule, and passes for nearly its whole length of about seventeen hundred miles from the south to the northwestern corner of the island, through an unsettled country. The purpose of this line is to connect settled Australia with the rest of the world by way of Java and India, and it passes through great districts of the interior, which were first explored for the purpose of its construction. Under the circumstances, it was not possible that telegraph facilities could be supplied in Australia on a small scale, or at a trifling cost.

The telegraph lines now owned and operated by the Federal Government for the people of Australia, have a length of fully

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

48,000 miles, while the length of the wires is considerably more than a hundred thousand miles. Thus, it will be seen, the people of Australia and their Government have a considerable experience of the cost both of constructing and operating a telegraph system. The mileage of their lines is actually greater than that of any European country with the exception of Russia, Germany and France; while, in proportion to the number of the inhabitants, it is probably nearly six times as great as that of any other country in the world, with the single exception of its near neighbor, New Zealand. There are upwards of three thousand telegraph stations kept open for the convenience of a population which does not exceed four millions; and the revenue derived from messages is shown to be sufficient to defray the cost of operating and maintaining the lines, as well as defraying the interest charges on the cost of construction at the annual rate of three per cent.

Under the circumstances, it would be natural to suppose that the charges for telegraphic service in Australia must be very high, and it is here that the debates in the Commonwealth Parliament, and the schedule of rates finally appended to the Act, throw an unexpected light on the question. It appears that in no part of Australia has the cost of telegraphy ever been high, and the rates now adopted as those which will secure the revenue from loss under the three heads of operating, maintaining, and paying interest on the money invested, are remarkably moderate when compared with those in force in most parts of the world, and not least in America. The rates finally settled were these: For town and suburban messages—suburban meaning practically a radius of ten miles beyond the city limits—the rate fixed is twelve cents for a message not exceeding sixteen words, which includes the address and signature. For messages to any point within the same State from which they are sent, the charge is fixed at eighteen cents for the same number of words. For messages to any other State within the Commonwealth, the charge for a message of similar length is twenty-four cents. In all cases, the charge for extra words beyond the sixteen is a uniform rate of two cents a word. Delivery is made within a radius of one mile from the receiving office, and for this there is no extra charge.

It will be seen at once that these charges are remarkable for

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

their moderation, in comparison with any experience the people of America have yet had; they are, in fact, lower for the service rendered, and the distances traversed, than the rates established in any other country except New Zealand, but they are fully justified by the experience of the three principal States of the Commonwealth—New South Wales, Victoria and Queensland—the tariffs of which have practically been adopted. When it is remembered that Australia, as a whole, is a country of the same area as the United States, and that the distances actually traversed are very much greater than those between any points of telegraph communication in America, it will be seen that the charge of twenty-four cents for a sixteen-word message is very much less than one-half, and would probably work out at about one-third, the amount charged in America. The great area of the five States occupying the mainland—three of the five being each more than two and a-half times as large as Texas, and a fourth four-fifths of its size—renders the State rate of eighteen cents for similar messages equally cheap compared with American rates; while the city and suburban tariff of twelve cents has no parallel in American experience.

The question which naturally arises at once is: How is it done? We have here a population of four millions of white men, scattered along a coastal belt of country some five thousand miles in length, with widely separated centres of population, enjoying the most modern facilities of communication to an extent far greater in proportion to their numbers, and at less than half the cost at which the same facilities are supplied to a population nearly twenty times as great and far less widely scattered. At the first glance there seems to be no reasonable way of accounting for the difference. To the advocates of public ownership and management of the great necessaries of modern civilized life, it would seem that the problem is by no means so serious. In the course of the debate in the Australian Federal Parliament, the Postmaster-General of the Commonwealth stated boldly that not only was the Australian telegraph system as efficient as any in the world, and, with the single exception of that of New Zealand, by far the cheapest, but that it was so owing to its public ownership, and to the economies naturally attending the system. A very brief examination of the facts will show that this claim is at any rate very largely founded on facts.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The three branches of expenditure dealt with by the Australian Minister for Postal Services were, the interest on the cost of constructing the lines, the cost of maintaining the lines in good order when constructed, and the working expenses of the service —including, of course, salaries of officials and workmen of all grades, office expenses and rentals, and the supply of electricity. Every telegraph system must provide for all these in some form or other, but a Government system, if honestly worked in the public interests, as the postal system is in this and other civilized countries, has great advantages in the direction of economy in two out of the three branches of expenditure. In the first place, the credit of a whole people is always better than the credit of any part of it, and therefore loans required by nations with a stable government, and a reasonable character for honesty, can always be obtained on the most favorable terms. Australia is a young though a wealthy community, and as a rule the value of money is somewhat higher there than in older countries; but the $18,000,000 of borrowed money spent by its various Colonial Governments on the construction of telegraph lines costs to-day, in interest, only a small fraction beyond three per cent. It need hardly be pointed out that such a return as this would not meet the views of any great mercantile corporation. It may fairly be said that the expenses coming under the second head of telegraph expenditure —that is to say, the actual cost of producing the necessary supply of electricity—would be quite as little in private hands as it could be made in the hands of a Government department. This, of course, is true; but there is no reason why it should be any less, except the foolish and shameful one that intelligence and honesty are not to be obtained for the service of the public. It is in the third class of the expenditure requisite for conducting a telegraph system, however,—the department of salaries and office expenses—where, it is claimed, the advantage of public ownership becomes an element of startling magnitude.

In Australia, the telegraph and telephone services are both incorporated with the Post-Office, and as such they require few, if any, separate offices. There are fully three thousand telegraph stations in the country for the convenience of the public, and nearly every one of these is also the district post-office. There are in the United States about 27,000 telegraph stations, but there are not less than 77,000 post-offices for the use of the people:

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that is to say, there is a post-office for every thousand, but a telegraph station for every three thousand. In the newer, poorer, and far less thickly settled country of Australia, there are fully six thousand post-offices to meet the requirement of four millions of people—or one to every 666 people; and more than three thousand of these are also telegraph stations—being one to about 1,300 persons. The contrast is suggestive, but it is most suggestive of all in its financial aspect. If every second post-office in this country were also a telegraph station, the public would be nearly as well supplied with the means of rapid communication as the settlers in Australia now are, instead of one third as well, and they would also be saved a great deal of money. In America it would then be, as it now is in the Commonwealth of the South Pacific—each telegraph station would be at the natural centre of population, where it would require no separate offices, and no separate staff of clerks and operators, except in cities of considerable size. Every country postmaster or clerk would in that case be required also to be a competent telegraph operator, and thus an endless duplication both of offices and officials would be avoided.

It is in this way that the Australian Postmaster-General accounts for the cheapness of his telegraph system when compared with the cost in other and older countries—but this is not all. The cost of production is low, and the machinery for carrying on the service is economical, indeed, but these things alone would not enable him to make both ends meet. The secret of its success is not only that it is economically conducted; not only that it is not loaded with heavy interest and big dividends; but, more than either, because it is appreciated and made use of by the people to an extent unknown where charges are higher, and conveniences are less. Of European nations Great Britain makes most use of the telegraph, but her population is concentrated within a small area and, therefore, is easily reached: her people use the telegraph to the extent of rather more than *two* messages a year for every inhabitant of the country. In the United States the population is more scattered and therefore more difficult to reach; three years ago the American people sent as nearly as possible *one* message over the telegraph wires for each inhabitant. In Australia population is more widely scattered than in America, and vastly more so than in England; yet three years ago *two and a half* mes-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sages for every inhabitant of the country passed over the telegraph wires of the Government. There is, it appears from the statement of the Australian Postmaster-General, only one country in the world that has supplied greater telegraphic facilities for its people, and has charged even lower rates than those of Australia, and that is the neighboring country of New Zealand. There, he admits, the Government supplies a post-office for every five hundred people, and a telegraph station for every eight hundred, and there too the rates are somewhat lower than even in Australia: he also adds, and the addition is a significant one, that there the people three years ago sent *four* telegrams for each inhabitant, and the revenue from the telegraphs was even more satisfactory than in Australia.

The lesson taught by the experience of Australia, and enforced by the official head of its postal department, is by no means a new one. It is, after all, neither more nor less than the stock argument in favor of the system of Trusts, which are advocated as a practical necessity in these days of competition, because, owing to the greatness of the scale on which they operate, they can save immensely on the cost of working, and therefore can, presumably, afford to give the public a better article at a lower price. This is exactly what, the Australian Postmaster-General asserts (and apparently beyond the reach of contradiction), the system of Government telegraphy does for the people of Australia. Only by the operation of this great public Trust, managed for the people by the people, would it be possible in a new country, of wide extent and thinly populated, to supply the facilities for speedy and reliable communication, except at a cost so enormous as to be prohibitory. Only by giving the public the facilities which such a public Trust alone can give, can they be induced to use the convenience on a scale so large as to make it pay. Such would seem to be the experience of Australia, and to even a greater extent of New Zealand.

HUGH H. LUSK.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

IS THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY INSINCERE?

BY JOSEPH S. AUERBACH.

JUSTLY or unjustly, there are laid at the door of the present Republican Administration serious charges of an arbitrary exercise of power, of the usurpation by the Executive of legislative functions, of unconstitutional acts, and of a general tendency not alone toward a centralization of power in the general Government at Washington, but toward a personalization of government in Mr. Roosevelt.

To all these charges a denial is interposed; and it is asserted with great frequency and emphasis by those high in the councils and confidence of the Republican Party, and by the President himself, that the Democratic Party in making these charges, and in its present appeal for popular support, is guilty of insincerity.

It remains with the great body of voters, who are not partisans from interest or habit, and whose support is essential to the success of either candidate, to pass upon these grave issues, submitted to them as to a great and impartial jury for their verdict.

As to the great, far-reaching significance of that verdict there should be no misapprehension.

If favorable to the Republican Party, it will be an approval, or at least a condonation, of acts which have been the subject of so much heated discussion for the past few months, and a deliberate acquiescence in the policy of that party, carried out through its accidental but accredited representative.

The acts of the agent, even if unauthorized and in excess of his delegated powers, will then have been ratified by the principal, and that principal will no longer be the Republican Party, but the American People.

The momentous question is whether we are prepared for that kind of an endorsement of the Republican Party.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It may be that we have come to a pass where such a distinct departure from precedents which have heretofore been our guide is defensible; but we need a good deal more to bring this home to us as a conviction than the specious insistence that a condemnation of the acts complained of will necessarily mean their undoing.

No such argument is entitled to serious consideration. On the contrary, under principles controlling with our courts and sanctioned by general usage, if rights have vested and rules of property, or even of conduct, have been established under acts indefensible in themselves but done with apparent authority, it may be that the acts in whole or in part must stand. The questions, however, whether such acts shall stand because these rights have vested and these rules have been established, or whether they shall stand as accepted precedents because the acts are right and defensible in themselves, give rise to wholly different answers. Even if every one of such acts must stand, the issue as to the character of these acts is not a dead, but a living, issue; for the issue then is not the thing done, but the principle pursuant to which it was done. Unless the Republican Party can so successfully defend its acts that the justification for its conduct is complete, without recourse to the argument as to the embarrassment which might follow a refusal to endorse these acts, then that party is not entitled to our support.

The just and the only legitimate method of applying the test of approval or disapproval to these acts is to consider what the people of the United States would do if Mr. Roosevelt were seeking election on a platform which set forth as part of its policy an intention to carry out, precisely as they were carried out, all those acts of which grave complaint is now made.

It is certain that Mr. Roosevelt cannot fairly object to this test, and it is equally certain that, in this way, we shall view these acts in a new and a rather startling light.

Let us, at the outset, fix upon the proper, justifiable methods for conducting such an inquiry.

We are not to be misled by the plausible claim that, at most, the departure from law and tradition is apparently insignificant. In the consideration of an unconstitutional or an indefensible act by an Executive or by a Legislature, the question is not what harm it may do, or how grave a departure from constitutional

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

principles or accepted tradition and precedent it may be, nor what are the motives which prompted the departure.

The question is whether there is any departure at all.

In our courts of law, invalid testamentary trusts, under statutes relating to the disposition of property, are not confined to those cases where it is apparent that the provisions must offend against the statute. The possibility of such a result is sufficient. So, also, our courts, finding a contracting party interested in the subject-matter of his trust, permit neither court nor jury to consider the transaction from the standpoint of its resulting injury or benefit. They condemn the transaction wherever the prohibited relation is disclosed.

Much more is great caution to be observed where the question under consideration is one involving the good faith of a nation, or the slightest assumption by an Executive of unconstitutional powers, or an inclination on his part to disregard constitutional limitations. The extent or degree of the offence is not of controlling moment. That it exists at all is sufficient to call for instant condemnation.

An occasion once arose where the President of the United States had undertaken merely to take from one of the Cabinet officers of the Government the right of determining where the public money should be deposited, and to exercise that function himself. Webster then uttered these words:

"It was strongly and forcibly urged, yesterday, by the honorable member from South Carolina, that the true and only mode of preserving any balance of power in mixed governments is to keep an exact balance. This is very true, and to this end encroachments must be resisted at the first step. The question is, therefore, whether, upon the true principles of the Constitution, this exercise of power by the President can be justified. Whether the consequences be prejudicial or not, if there be an illegal exercise of power it is to be resisted in the proper manner. Even if no harm or inconvenience results from transgressing the boundary, the intrusion is not to be suffered to pass unnoticed. Every encroachment, great or small, is important enough to awaken the attention of those who are entrusted with the preservation of a constitutional government. We are not to wait till great public mischiefs come, till the government is overthrown, or liberty itself put into extreme jeopardy. We should not be worthy sons of our fathers were we so to regard great questions affecting the general feeling. Those fathers accomplished the Revolution on a strict question of principle. The Parliament of Great Britain asserted a right to tax the Colonies in all cases whatsoever; and it was pre-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cisely on this question that they made the Revolution turn. The amount of taxation was trifling, but the claim itself was inconsistent with liberty; and that was, in their eyes, enough. It was against the recital of an Act of Parliament, rather than against any suffering under its enactments, that they took up arms. They went to war against a preamble. They fought seven years against a declaration. They poured out their treasures and their blood like water, in a contest against an assertion which those less sagacious and not so well schooled in the principles of civil liberty would have regarded as barren phraseology or mere parade of words. They saw in the claim of the British Parliament a seminal principle of mischief, the germ of unjust power; they detected it, dragged it forth from underneath its plausible disguises, struck at it; nor did it elude either their steady eye or their well-directed blow till they had extirpated it and destroyed it to the smallest fibre. On this question of principle, while actual suffering was yet afar off, they raised their flag against the Power to which, for purposes of foreign conquest and subrogation, Rome, in the height of her glory, is not to be compared; a Power which is dotted over the surface of the whole globe, with her possessions and military posts, whose morning drum-beat, following the sun, and keeping company with the hours, circles the earth with one continuous and unbroken strain of the martial airs of England.

"The necessity of holding strictly to the principles upon which free governments are constructed, and to those precise lines which fix the partitions of power between different branches, is as plain, if not as cogent, as that of resisting, as our fathers did, the strides of the parent country against the rights of the Colonies; because, whether the power which exceeds its just limits be foreign or domestic, whether it be the encroachment of all branches on the rights of the people, or that of one branch on the rights of others, in either case the balanced and well-adjusted machinery of free government is disturbed, and, if the derangement go on, the whole system must fall."

Nor, again, are we to be held to any strict requirement of proof as to the motives for such acts.

Motives are elusive, and, whether the acts were committed from good or from wrong motives is not a question of first importance.

The Presidency of the United States is a trusteeship held for its beneficiary—the people of the United States. The rules laid down for the guidance of the Trustee are found in the Constitution, in our statutes, in the decisions of our courts and in precedents established by a long course of national conduct. No one but the beneficiary has given, or could give, to the Trustee a license to depart from these rules. The President does not create these rules—he obeys them. It may have been the intention of the President—and we should be prepared to concede much to one

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of his high character—to do justice always; but the people of this country cannot be expected to acquiesce in the attempt of the Executive to make laws, however just, rather than to execute laws as they exist, any more than they would be content that courts of law should discard all precedents, and attempt to render decisions according to some freshly devised theory of right and wrong, as each case arose for decision.

We are free, in matters such as are now under discussion, to rest our final judgment on a foundation much less substantial than that of established proof of facts. The present inquiry is not similar to a trial in a court of law. It may be likened rather to the proceedings of an investigating committee of a legislature, where impressions, at times even hearsay, and a general course of conduct are all properly to be taken into consideration and given due weight.

Only in this case all these conditions are much more applicable, for the question at issue is what hereafter shall be our standards for national conduct, and the investigating committee is the American People.

We are to determine whether the Republican Party is entitled to our endorsement in much the same way in which we come to a conclusion as to the character of an individual.

From a consideration of these acts, not as isolated or unrelated, but in association with other acts, and from the character of the defence interposed, we are to conclude whether the charges against the Administration of Mr. Roosevelt are just.

We must bear in mind that the acts complained of find their source and inspiration and their defence in the doctrine of centralization, which is the creed of the Republican Party, and that the personalization of government is the natural but the dangerous offspring of centralization. The imperceptible but resistless drift of legislation for which the Republican Party is responsible, and of much judicial interpretation of that legislation and of the Constitution itself, promoted and sanctioned by Republican doctrine, has to-day stripped the several States of much of their individuality, so that in some vital essentials they are no longer States, but mere Boroughs.

Chief-Justice Marshall, a man whose views were not always in accord with those of Jefferson, the founder and apostle of Democracy, said:

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"No political dreamer was ever wild enough to think of breaking down the lines which separate the States and of compounding the people into one common mass."

If we are prepared to stand idly by and see, not dreamers but men, active, aggressive, in the control of a great party, and of the machinery of government, break down these lines, then we have enthroned new leaders and exalted wholly new standards.

Nor are we to be turned aside from an investigation of these questions by a recital of past shortcomings of the Democratic Party.

We are not dealing with offences of either party, other than those which are of vital import in this election. The Democratic Party has often come short of its high purposes; it has disappointed its followers and forfeited their support. But it has recanted its errors; it has returned to its old allegiance, and has consecrated itself anew to its old articles of faith. Whether it is sincere in this must be gathered largely from what it has to say as to the conduct of the Republican Party during the past few years, and from the kind of candidate it has offered for the suffrages of the American People.

And, finally and above all, in such an inquiry we are to resolve all doubts not in favor of the Republican Party or of Mr. Roosevelt, but of the Nation.

In the light of these suggestions, let us apply the test suggested and inquire briefly whether, if it were now proposed by the Republican Party to pursue the course it has adopted and to commit the acts now complained of, we should give or withhold our approval.

Let us suppose, therefore, that the announced intention of the Republican Party in its platform were, if successful in this canvass:

That the President of the United States would, after a refusal by Congress to pass a pension law, put into force Pension Order No. 78, which was a substitute for such legislation;

That the party should announce that over remote territorial possessions, which were acquired and which can be held only by a vast navy, our flag was to float for the protection of subjects against internal disorder, and not as a symbol of American citizenship;

That the building of the Panama Canal was to be compassed

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by a resort to practices which, it would not be difficult to establish, would involve a breach of faith with another nation, coupled with an arbitrary unconstitutional act;

That the President would devise the new political expedient of a constructive recess of Congress to secure, out of all order of legitimate preferment, the appointment of a friend to a major-generalship of the United States Army;

That he would in a series of addresses throughout this country advocate an amendment to the Constitution of the United States that would, if adopted, operate to so obliterate State lines, that the "compounding of the people into one common mass" would be seriously threatened;

That we were to be treated to episodes of the "We want either Perdicaris alive or Raisuli dead" order; and that we were to have our navy move from point to point, not for display or discipline, but for threatened action;

That weak but independent nations were to be lectured and threatened, as by a pedagogue armed to the teeth, about their manners and their debts, in language like the following used by Mr. Roosevelt:

> "Any country whose people conduct themselves well can count upon our hearty friendliness. If a nation shows that it knows how to act with decency in industrial and political matters, if it keeps order and pays its obligations, then it need fear no interference from the United States. Brutal wrong-doing or an impotence which results in the general loosening of the ties of civilized society may finally require intervention by some civilized nation, and in the Western Hemisphere the United States cannot ignore its duty;"

That we were thus to see the Monroe Doctrine evolved into a new doctrine that is entitled in all justice to be baptized the Roosevelt Doctrine;

And that, generally, a centralized, a personalized, and a kind of *vi et armis* theory of government was to be set up for our worship;

What, under such conditions, would the people do at this Election?

Unless this Administration can stand this test of its acts—disassociated wholly from any consideration of the inadvisability or impracticability of undoing what has been done—it must be condemned, and condemned utterly.

The limitations of a magazine article forbid anything like an

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

extended discussion of these questions. The answer to some is apparent without discussion. The answer to others is equally apparent if we trace these acts to their source and inspiration, in the chief article of faith of the Republican Party, the centralization of government; for, from the centralization of government, it is only one and a very short step to the personalization of government, and from the latter the step is imperceptible to a Government which shall act upon personal caprice and be on the borderland, and perhaps within the province, of indifference to all law and precedent.

Though the scheme was immature and died in birth, nothing could better illustrate the way in which the Constitution is regarded by Mr. Roosevelt than what he did, a year or two ago, in the matter of a proposed amendment to the Constitution, advocated by him, not once, but in a series of speeches throughout the country.

In order that there should be centred in Washington a control over large corporations, Mr. Roosevelt proposed and advocated, over and over again, an amendment to the Constitution on the ground that:

> "Our Constitution was framed when the economic conditions were so different that each State could easily be left to handle the corporations as it saw fit."

With the evil which might result from any such interpretation of the Constitution the evil, however great it may be, of large corporations is not to be compared.

To the United States Constitution we look as the source of authority and power, and, not finding them there, they belong to the States, and not to Congress, nor to the President. Under any other interpretation the whole theory of the Constitution would be reversed, for the Constitution would thus be given the force and effect of a State Constitution, which is looked to for prohibitions upon legislative and executive action. From this the step is easy, not alone to the promulgation of immature schemes for reshaping and tinkering with the Constitution, but also to an interpretation which may be the basis for even lawlessness.

The end of Mr. Roosevelt's plan was to give a definite control, as he expressed it, to "Some Sovereign" over our large corporations, and therefore over the great bulk of our commercial transactions; the means by which he proposed to carry out his plan was

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a scheme, substantially, to obliterate State lines. The erroneous theory upon which the amendment was sought to be justified was, that when the Constitution was framed, each State was in a position where it could easily be "left to handle" the corporations within its limits as it saw fit. But no one "left" anything to the States. On the contrary, the powers of the Federal Government represent simply the sum total of the concessions from the several States. The States retained what they did not part with. This is not a technical and over-refined distinction. It is fundamental, and on it rests one of the underlying principles of construction of the Constitution, and by the express language of the Constitution itself, among its first amendments, it was provided that:

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

There has been extended debate concerning the Pension Order of Mr. Roosevelt, but much of it is irrelevant. Comparatively, the question as to how much money the Pension Order takes from the Treasury of the United States is not of such great concern; the question of importance is how much has it taken away from the constitutional foundation on which this Government rests. A reference to any precedent set by Mr. Cleveland or by Mr. McKinley is of little moment, because the conditions were different. But assume that they were in part similar, they did not act immediately prior to a political convention at which either was a candidate, nor by a usurpation of the legislative function, when the whole subject was under consideration by Congress. There were at least four pension bills pending in Congress—three or more in the House of Representatives and one in the Senate—when this order was promulgated. All of these bills were of similar import and one of them was in effect the same as the Pension Order. The mere pendency of such bills was evidence that, in the opinion of Congress, legislation was essential to authorize the act which the order of Mr. Roosevelt sought to accomplish.

The proposed legislation failed of enactment. Then the President took the matter into his own hands, and authorized or approved the order which operated as having the effect of a law which Congress had declined to enact.

If a corporation, having sought and having failed to secure legislative authority for the carrying out of some corporate pur-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pose, thereupon lawlessly puts its scheme into effect, could it reasonably look for anything but condemnation of its course? Much less can the President expect to escape like condemnation, for he is violating the plain letter of the Constitution, no matter what his motive may have been. The question fairly to-day before the voters of the United States is: Suppose the candidate of the Republican Party should announce that, if elected to the Presidency, he would, in the event that certain pension bills in Congress failed of passage, authorize or sanction and then defend the issue of an order which was to have all the force and effect of a legislative act.

Would the people of the United States, in the face of such a declaration, elect Mr. Roosevelt? There is no middle ground. Mr. Roosevelt's defence cannot stop short of such an endorsement. If we should not be prepared to authorize in advance such a performance, Mr. Roosevelt does not deserve election, simply because the revocation of the order might now operate as an injury to many people entitled to the lasting gratitude and consideration of the nation.

How can the act be regarded as being other than what it was termed in the Senate of the United States, "a piece of Executive Legislation"?

It was stated, too, in the Senate, with much emphasis and with equal truth, that the order was taken bodily from the Bill, and was issued when it became evident that the Bill was not likely to become a law. And it was issued on the eve of a Presidential convention at which Mr. Roosevelt was a candidate for nomination.

The order reads:

"Ordered, (1) In the adjudication of pension claims under said act of June 27th, 1890, as amended, it shall be taken and considered as an evidential fact, if the contrary does not appear, and if all other legal requirements are properly met, that when a claimant has passed the age of 62 years he is disabled one-half in ability to perform manual labor, and is entitled to be rated at $6 per month; after 65 years, at $8 per month; after 68 years, at $10 per month, and after 70 years, at $12 per month."

One of the pending Bills reads as follows:

"That every officer or enlisted man in the Army or Navy of the United States coming within the provisions of the second section of the act of June 27th, 1890, as amended by the act of May 9th, 1900, who is or may become 62 years of age shall be pensioned under said acts at $6 per

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

month, and every one who is or may become 65 years of age shall be pensioned at $8 per month; those who are or may become 68 years of age shall be pensioned at $10 per month, and those who are or who may become 70 years of age shall be pensioned at $12 per month."

An attempted reply in part is that Judge Parker has announced that, if elected, he will recall the order and will favor the enactment of an old-age pension law, which will, it is claimed, make a drain upon the Treasury greater than that brought about by Mr. Roosevelt's act. But this is no reply. Judge Parker is advocating a law to be passed by Congress; he is not proposing to usurp the province of Congress. The people of the United States can afford to pay many millions of dollars annually to those who defended the Union. They can afford to pay no tribute to an unconstitutional act or to an exhibition of arbitrariness and a defiance of public opinion and of the legislative will. The President of the United States is expected to be the servant of the people,—not their master.

There may have been a great pressure upon the Administration to do what it did, and its enthusiasm, and not alone its political interests, may have run with the pressure, but we are not required to be content with an Administration which is "the slave of circumstance and impulse."

To the extent that rights may be said to have vested under such an order we must, under the familiar principle of law to which we have referred, see that, in setting the matter right, it be done without prejudice to those who might be embarrassed by the change. To that end a law substantially requisite to replace an unlawful order is defensible, even though the law involves the outgo of more money from the Treasury than would have been necessary but for the promulgation of the order.

Suppose, again, that the Republican Party should announce in its platform that it intended to secure the right to build the Panama Canal in the way in which that project has been begun. Then the question would be, not "What are you going to do about it, now that the act has been committed?" but "What will you do by way of conferring original authority for the act?"

It would then be set forth in the platform of the Republican Party, that its candidate for President of the United States, if elected, would seek to increase our commercial prosperity by promoting the building of the Panama Canal, if possible, by treaty

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with Colombia; that, if he failed in this, he would refuse to obey the Spooner Act, which enjoined his then entering upon negotiations for the construction of the Nicaragua Canal; that if, in the course of the negotiations with Colombia, that part of Colombia within which is included the Panama route should revolt, he would forthwith recognize the insurgents as a Republic, and that, if Colombia should seek to repossess itself of the territory which had been thus torn from its rightful owner, the President of the United States, under the guise and pretence—for it is nothing else—of keeping a covenant of peace under a treaty to the rights of which Colombia had succeeded, would by threat and force of arms, and, by a bold usurpation of authority vested only in Congress, to all intents and purposes declare war upon Colombia and forbid that attempt; that the Republican Party would thereupon put a premium of $10,000,000 upon rebellion, by a payment of that sum to a band of insurgents; and, lastly, and worst of all, that this course toward a weak sister nation would be defended, on the ground that such nation was obdurate and unreasonable, and that by any other course the construction of the inter-ocean waterway would have been long postponed.

Would the people then elect Mr. Roosevelt upon such an issue? Would they vote for that kind of a canal? Would they vote to have the Constitution overriden and war declared, not by Congress, but as completely by the caprice of a President as it is by that of any ruler on the Continent of Europe, hedged in by no constitutional restraint? This is no idle academic question before us. The gravity of the issue cannot be exaggerated. If the American People are not prepared to go so far as to say they would now confer original authority for such a defiance of the Constitution, then the candidate of the party responsible for this act is not entitled to be elected simply because the act cannot be wholly undone.

It is said that we did not promote the rebellion in Panama. The disclaimer of preliminary information on the subject by the Administration is confined to the statement by the President in his report to Congress, in January, 1904, that, save for certain official information and reports accompanying the message,

> **"no one connected with this Government had any previous knowledge of the revolution, except such as was accessible to any person of ordinary intelligence who read the newspapers and kept up a current acquaintance with public affairs."**

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Now there is brought to light a letter, written on October 10, 1903, at the White House, to a friend, in which, among other things, Mr. Roosevelt said:

"I cast aside the proposition made at this time to foment the secession of Panama. Whatever other governments can do, the United States cannot go into the securing, by such underhand means, the cession."

Who made the proposition thus cast aside, and under what auspices was it made? What was the suggestion as to co-operation by us in promoting the secession of Panama, and what was to be the consideration to us? These are pertinent questions, and will, perhaps, have to be answered some day.

But the immediate questions are, why was there not laid before Congress all the information, or at least as much of it as was communicated to a friend, concerning this political intrigue, to which it now appears we were a proposed party? Who authorized the President of the United States, however much he may regard himself as the impersonation of the Government, to withhold information upon a subject concerning which he was presumably making a complete communication to Congress? On what theory did he regard himself as authorized to argue, and not in duty bound to state, the case just as it was?

Such a course may be justified elsewhere, but we are of the view that it will not be long tolerated in this country. Humiliating, indeed, must be the reading of these two statements, not alone to those who are friendly, but to those who are opposed to Mr. Roosevelt. The reading is alarming, too, as an indication of many things attempted to be pointed out in this article.

When some advocate shall make it appear that these two conflicting statements can be reconciled and that Mr. Roosevelt dealt in entire candor with Congress, he will earn the lasting gratitude of the American people. As the case now stands, however, it does not seem likely that any such fee can come out of this miserable mess.

There is an attempted defence of this Panama affair by Mr. Roosevelt and his supporters. That of Mr. Roosevelt is, perhaps, the best. He says in his letter of acceptance:

"Our opponents can criticise what we did in Panama only on condition of misstating what was done. The Administration behaved throughout not only with good faith, but with extraordinary patience and large generosity toward those with whom it dealt. It was also mindful of American interests. It acted in strict compliance with the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

law passed by Congress. Had not Panama been promptly recognized, and the transit across the Isthmus kept open, in accordance with our treaty rights and obligations, there would have ensued endless guerilla warfare and possibly foreign complications; while all chance of building the canal would have been deferred, certainly for years, perhaps for a generation or more."

We are entitled to dismiss the statement that the Administration behaved throughout with extraordinary patience and large generosity toward those with whom it dealt, with the simple comment that the patience was of a wholly novel sort, true patience bearing to it about the same relation that sense bears to nonsense; and that the generosity seems to have been generosity only to stockholders in a canal company which was insolvent, and toward insurgents who were successful, if not through our alliance, at least by our connivance. That the Administration was not mindful of American interests is clear, for those interests could not best be subserved by the commission of a breach of national faith. Of course, it did not act in strict compliance with the law passed by Congress, because that law is mandatory in requiring the President to enter upon negotiations for the construction of the Nicaragua Canal if the Panama route could not be secured within a reasonable time—by treaty, be it remembered, and not by profit-sharing in a rebellion.

The fact that Mr. Roosevelt ignores this mandate and pleads that, by any course other than that adopted by him, the building of the canal would have been indefinitely deferred indicates the extremity to which he is obliged to resort in an attempt to justify his course.

The conjecture that guerilla warfare and possibly foreign complications would have ensued, but for the recognition of this one-day-old republic, is without justification. In fact, the more that light is let in upon this despicable affair—and light is being let in altogether too rapidly for the Republican peace of mind, one might conclude—the more the presumption grows into a conviction that Colombia, if not overawed by us, the Guarantor of her Sovereignty over Panama, would forthwith have suppressed that petty plot called, only by courtesy, a rebellion.

If we are going to conjecture as to what things might have happened if we had failed to act as we did, with how much more propriety may we not conjecture what another President may do, acting from purely evil motives—which we must all be prepared to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

concede did not control Mr. Roosevelt—if this precedent be approved by a vote of the American people!

The fact is that the whole defence for Mr. Roosevelt of the Panama Canal episode falls to the ground. It is claimed by his supporters that, by our Treaty with New Granada, we were bound to do, or at least were justified in doing, what we did.

The claim cannot be sustained. The Treaty imposed reciprocal obligations upon the two contracting parties.

On the one hand, New Granada guaranteed to the United States the right to enjoy the ports of New Granada as they were enjoyed by her citizens; and, also,

"that right of way or transit across the Isthmus of Panama upon any modes of communication that now exist or that may hereafter be constructed, shall be open and free to the government and citizens of the United States; and for transportation of any articles of produce, manufacture or merchandise of lawful commerce belonging to the citizens of the United States, upon the same terms as to the citizens of New Granada."

On the other hand,

"The United States guarantee positively and efficaciously to New Granada by the present stipulation, the perfect neutrality of the beforementioned Isthmus, with the view that free transit from the one to the other sea may not be interrupted or embarrassed in any future time while this Treaty exists; and in consequence the United States also guarantee, in the same manner, the rights of sovereignty and property which New Granada has and possesses over the said territory."

To the rights and obligations of New Granada, the United States of Colombia, and subsequently the Republic of Colombia, succeeded. The regularity of this succession and the sovereignty of the two republics were officially recognized by us in our diplomatic relations with them; two or more treaties were made and ratified between us and the United States of Colombia, and at least one was made and ratified between us and the Republic of Colombia, prior to the ill-fated Hay-Herran treaty. By a recognition of the new Republic of Panama and by forbidding the recovery by Colombia of the territory in revolt that we by treaty were bound to aid and not to obstruct, we prevented Colombia from fulfilling her guaranty to us. Then, by a claim that Colombia had not kept her part of the bargain, made impossible by our conduct, we repudiated our part of the treaty, which was to uphold the sovereignty of Colombia. We not only did all this, but,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by the precipitate recognition of the so-called Republic of Panama, we pursued a course which, if it had been adopted by foreign governments toward us in the time of the Civil War, might have made unsuccessful our effort to preserve the Union.

Mr. Root, in his defence of the Panama Canal incident, speaks of "the seizure by Panama of the opportunity to renew her oft-repeated effort to throw off the hateful and oppressive yoke of Colombia." But who set us up as judges to determine that the yoke of Colombia was hateful and oppressive? We recognized her sovereignty over Panama, and, however hateful and oppressive the yoke may have been, there can be no fair question that we should not have been guilty of a precipitate recognition of Panama but for the fact that we had in prospect the construction of the Canal. The question, however, cannot be discussed from any academic standpoint. We were under agreement not to do as we did, for the reason that we had undertaken by solemn treaty to guarantee the sovereignty of Colombia over Panama.

The following is the account of our stewardship as a Guarantor of Sovereignty. On the third of November, 1903, occurred the "uprising with no bloodshed" consisting of the arrest of two Colombian officers. Four days thereafter, we in the interval, and as matter of fact, before the uprising, having forbidden the movement of Colombian troops across the isthmus or any other hostile action by Colombia, three persons—"the dauntless Three" perhaps, who were about as much entitled to speak for a real republic as the three tailors of Tooley Street were entitled to petition Parliament as "We the people of England"—communicated by cable to the United States that the new Republic of Panama had been born. Recognition by us of the Republic took place on the day following, by this announcement, "The people of Panama, by an apparently unanimous movement, dissolved their political connection with the Republic of Colombia, and resumed their independence, and having adopted a Government of their own, republican in form, with which the Government of the United States has entered into relations, the President of the United States, in accordance with the ties of friendship which have so long and so happily existed between the respective nations, most earnestly commends to the Governments of Colombia and of Panama the peaceful and equitable settlement of all questions at issue between them. He holds that he is bound, not merely by

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

treaty obligations, but by the interests of civilization, to see that the peaceful traffic of the world across the Isthmus of Panama shall not longer be disturbed by a constant succession of unnecessary and wasteful civil wars."

The farce was thus complete.

"Do our opponents," flippantly asks Mr. Roosevelt in his letter of acceptance, "grudge the fifty millions paid for the Panama Canal?" No, perhaps not, but they do begrudge the stain which it has put upon our national honor, and they believe that in this they speak, not for the Democratic Party, but for the American People.

We are told by Mr. Hay, in his panegyric on Mr. Roosevelt, that "in times of doubt and difficulty the thought oftenest in his heart is 'What in such a case would Lincoln have done?'" The source of the trouble then must be that few cases of doubt and difficulty ever present themselves to Mr. Roosevelt when bent upon the accomplishment of his purpose, inasmuch as evidence of any such heart referendum is so rarely apparent in his political life.

Clearly, in the spoliation of Colombia there seems to have been no "doubt or difficulty"; nor, to complete the alliteration, was there any delay.

What a travesty it all is! To intimate even that Lincoln, with his infinite charity and forbearance, and with his deep religious devotion to principle and his subordination of self, would, under like conditions, not only without the authority, but against the mandate of a statute and of the Constitution, have done what Mr. Roosevelt did to Colombia, and in other ways would have made history as Mr. Roosevelt has made history, comes perilously near being a libel upon our martyred dead.

In a noted case before the Supreme Court of the United States, the question at issue was the right of maintenance of an action of ejectment against property held for the account of the United States. In the course of the argument, one of the Justices of the Court, in order to emphasize his intimation that such an action should not be maintained, asked of the counsel what his view would be where a plaintiff should be successful in a similar action instituted to recover Government land used for a lighthouse, which would thereby be dismantled.

The answer of the counsel was:

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Better that the lighthouse never should be lighted than that the Light of the Law should be extinguished."

On the eve of the great battle of Plassey, which was to determine the question of the possession of India by the English nation, Omichund, an ally, was about to play the British false. He was bribed by Lord Clive to remain true, and the understanding was to be set down in a treaty which Omichund supposed to have been signed by representatives of the English nation. The paper delivered to him was a substituted paper, and even that paper did not bear the signature it purported to bear. The biographer of Clive sought to defend it. Concerning the defence, Macaulay says:

"We should not think it necessary to offer any remarks for the purpose of directing the judgment of our readers with respect to this transaction, had not Sir John Malcolm undertaken to defend it in all its parts. He regrets, indeed, that it was necessary to employ means so liable to abuse as forgery; but he will not admit that any blame attaches to those who deceived the deceiver. He thinks that the English were not bound to keep faith with one who kept no faith with them, and that, if they had fulfilled their engagements with the wily Bengalee, so signal an example of successful treason would have produced a crowd of imitators. Now, we will not discuss this point on any rigid principles of morality. Indeed it is quite unnecessary to do so. For, looking at the question as a question of expediency in the lowest sense of the word, and using no arguments but such as Machiavelli might have employed in his conferences with Borgia, we are convinced that Clive was altogether in the wrong, and that he committed, not merely a crime, but a blunder. That honesty is the best policy is a maxim which we firmly believe to be generally correct, even with respect to the temporal interest of individuals; but with respect to societies, the rule is subject to still fewer exceptions, and that for this reason, that the life of societies is longer than the life of individuals. It is possible to mention men who have owed great worldly prosperity to breaches of private faith; but we doubt whether it be possible to mention a state which has, on the whole, been a gainer by a breach of public faith."

The Republic of Colombia had failed, it is asserted, to act in a spirit of fairness toward our Government. Though there is no complete proof of this, suppose it be conceded. Still, Colombia owed us no obligation to accept the treaty we proposed, fair though it may have been. Omichund, owing the English nation the obligations of an ally, was treacherous on the eve of battle; yet treachery to him has been condemned. If Macaulay be right—and who will have the hardihood to say that he is wrong?—how much less justification was there for our action toward Colombia, even

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

though that weaker nation was contumacious and was not acting as we thought would best enable us to promote the construction of a means of communication perhaps needed by us and by the whole world?

It is said by the Psalmist that he shall dwell in the tabernacle of the Lord and shall rest upon His holy hill and shall never fall, who among other things "hath not done evil to his neighbor, and hath not slandered his neighbor; and that sweareth unto his neighbor and disappointeth him not, though it were to his own hindrance." And whether we like to recognize it or not, we have come short of the standard of the Psalmist, for we profited by, even if we did not promote, a rebellion by which Colombia was stripped of her possessions; we set up an unworthy attack upon that nation as a justification and defence for the course we had pursued; and, more than all, we broke a solemn treaty obligation, for our commercial advantage.

To the extent that this wrong can be righted, reparation should, after full investigation, be made to the Republic of Colombia freely and promptly, if only for the reason, selfish though it be—though there are other reasons—that the act shall not serve as an accepted precedent, and that one stain upon the page of our history may be blotted out forever.

The danger in all such acts is not alone in themselves. Unless such an act be condemned, then, under the rule of law to which we have referred, it becomes a precedent for future misconduct, and whether it be right or wrong it may bind us as a people to the extent that rights have vested and rules of property and of conduct have become established under it; and it is to be remembered as a warning that it is rarely in great situations like these that such rights do not vest, and such rules do not become established.

Great danger, too, lurks in the condonation of such an act, for it is an accepted law of ethics that punishment in the Court of Conscience, unlike that in Courts of Law, lessens with each repeated and unrebuked offence; and it should be a matter of grave concern, that we do not deaden our sensibilities as a people to that which makes for righteous national conduct.

The whole Panama incident is defensible only as an act of expediency, and that defence is always demurrable when the charge is of a violation of the honor and the good faith of a State.

It is not a bright page in American history and never can be.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

No doubt, it was desirable to secure an interocean waterway, but it would have been better that vessels should round the Cape until the end of time than that we, for any purpose, should have shortened the route by the practices with which we stand charged.

When Grover Cleveland, as Governor of the State of New York, was called upon to consider a bill passed by the Legislature reducing the fares on the Elevated Railroad, he vetoed a popular measure because his courage and adherence to principle, of which this action was but one of many manifestations, forbade him to accept expediency as his guide. He said:

> "But we have specially in our keeping the honor and good faith of a great State, and we should see to it that no suspicion attaches, through any act of ours, to the fair fame of the commonwealth. The State should not only be strictly just but scrupulously fair, and in its relations to the citizens every legal and moral obligation should be recognized. . . .
>
> "The experiences of other States teach us that we must keep within the limits of law and good faith, lest in the end we bring upon the very people whom we seek to benefit and protect a hardship which must surely follow when these limits are ignored."

As we have attempted to point out, the other acts of the Republican Party referred to, though differing in degree, are of common origin with those discussed, and are all manifestations of a determination on the part of the Republican Party to go forward with its purposes, if deemed expedient, regardless of means or of precedents laid down for our guidance, to be as mindful of the business of other people as we are of our own; to rule and not to serve the people.

It remains only to add this commentary as to the policy and conduct of that party.

The Democratic Party stands opposed to these acts. It insists that our national faith shall be kept at all times. It insists that the tariff shall be reconstructed so that injustice to the many shall not continue to be committed for the benefit of the few, and that an artificial income, abnormally large, shall not afford the basis or the incitement for profligate expenditures. It insists that we shall have a Government of peace as well as prosperity. It insists that, as we grow great and powerful, we shall be considerate to all nations. It insists that States are safe only so long as principles hold sway, even though conduct may at times fall short of the ideals which these principles enjoin; and it insists that we shall not, by our indifference, or by our approval of or acquiescence in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

wrong acts, permit to be set up in this country false gods for worship.

If this be insincerity, then, clearly, insincerity is synonymous with love of country.

The Democratic Party insists that we have been burdened by the fortunes of war with the execution of a great trust in the Philippines, and not with the continued possession of a great territory—made possible only by a formidable navy, which it is now proposed to expand indefinitely—and it insists that to discharge that trust and hand back these lands to its inhabitants, free and independent, under conditions that will insure to us always a dominating moral and commercial influence there, involves no such nonsense as hauling down the flag of our country in dishonor; but it insists that, when that day of rejoicing shall have come to the Philippines, our flag for the first time will be raised there in triumph. It insists that for us, in the promotion of any world-wide scheme or policy, to hold possession of this territory for one moment beyond the time when its citizens are entitled to receive it, would be no more justifiable than would be the action of a trustee who might appropriate funds of which he was not the beneficiary, but the mere temporary custodian.

It insists that the duty of doing prompt and full justice to the people of the Philippines can be more safely entrusted to the Democratic Party, which regards our occupation of that territory as a misfortune, rather than to the Republican Party, which asserts that we are entitled to claim over it a rightful ownership.

Nor, in insisting that we shall thus limit our possession of territory, is the Democratic Party called upon to repudiate the doctrine of its founder, and to call in question the wisdom of the Louisiana Purchase; for Jefferson, in his correspondence with Madison, maintained that nothing should ever be accepted by us in the way of additional territory which would require a navy for its defence.

That the Democratic Party in all this is sincere, no one can doubt who hears a recitation of what it stands for, and what it stands opposed to, in this campaign. The kind of candidate it has selected is good evidence of its sincerity.

He stands for sound learning, and was a trained lawyer before he became the accomplished and honored presiding Judge of the Court of Appeals; he has lived true to the ideals and traditions of that court. He is a safe Judge and a safe man. There is no one

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

who has yet had the effrontery to say that anything but high motives have governed his judicial utterances. He stands as a man for all that makes manhood worth while, for a simple and rugged straightforwardness, for plain living and right thinking. He may not devote much time to exhibitions of the arts of rhetoric or to high-sounding phrases, but it may be that we have been fed in this country so much on highly seasoned, spectacular stuff, that we are no longer satisfied with the homely fare of simple, old-fashioned, forcible statement. If Judge Parker is not strenuous, he is at least of that dignity which will consort well with the administration of the high office for which he is a candidate; and if he does not go about armed to the teeth, we can yet claim that he is "rich in saving common sense."

Great problems are in process of being worked out in this country. At one extreme stands the Republican Party with its erroneous conception of government, that supreme power rests and is to be augmented in the National Government, asserting by its acts that the means are not to be so much regarded as the end; that power shall be exerted arbitrarily and without warrant of law or of the Constitution, provided only it work out to our commercial and financial benefit. Allied with the Republican Party, concededly, are vast, concentrated and powerful commercial and financial interests—not in themselves necessarily of injury to society, but believed by many to contain the source of great possible future peril.

At the other extreme are the dangerous forces which are bred and nourished in unrest and discontent, and whose emancipation from error only education, coupled with right example, can effect. If the record of the Republican Party for the past few years be now endorsed, and if the protest now urged against a course of political conduct which has been opposed to law and constitutional restraint be disregarded, will not an ominous object lesson have been presented to those representing this unrest and discontent, and may not they conclude that there is no good reason why they, too, should not seize the opportunity when it seems to them ripe and use any means which will accomplish what they regard as a justifiable end, though we know that end to be disaster?

We have boundless territory and great prosperity,—and national prosperity, it must be admitted, is essential to the accomplishment of the greatest good,—but to attain this prosperity we

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cannot afford to see weakened the foundations upon which our security rests. Already on the subject of slavery this country has been torn asunder by a war in which great blood and treasure were poured out for the maintenance of the Union itself. That our country will survive in all its undiminished vigor, with increasing power for usefulness, should be the conviction of every citizen. But this conviction will become only a hope, and perhaps not even a reasonable hope at that, if we deliberately incur the new perils which a lack of reverence for the Constitution is bound to create.

If, however, on the other hand, when doubts arise as to our duty as a people, we have ever present in our thoughts the conditions under which republican government here was begun, and have regard for whatsoever things are elevated and uplifting, rejecting utterly as a people the doctrine that expediency furnishes a satisfactory rule for conduct; if we live true to the standards set up for our guidance by the founders of the Republic, and keep untiring watch over their legacy to us, permitting no man and no party, whether from good or from evil motives, to filch one farthing of that treasure from us, then this Government must go forward to fresh triumphs, not alone in material advancement, but in all that makes for true greatness and for lasting renown.

Emerson says, as he prophesies of the future of the Republic, "The spread eagle must fold his foolish wings, and be less of a peacock." And then he adds:

> "In this country, with our practical understanding, there is, at present, a great sensualism, a headlong devotion to trade, to trade and to the conquest of continent—to each man as large a share of the same as he can carve for himself—an extravagant confidence in our talent and activity, which becomes, whilst successful, a scornful materialism, but with the fault, of course, that it has no depth, no reserved force to fall back upon when a reverse comes."

Matthew Arnold, too, has given us this out of the rich storehouse of his intelligence:

> "And the philosophers and the prophets, whom I at any rate am disposed to believe, and who say that moral causes govern the standing and the falling of States, will tell us that the failure to mind whatsoever things are elevated must impair with an inexorable fatality the life of a nation, just as the failure to mind whatsoever things are just, or whatsoever things are pure, will impair it; and that if the failure to mind whatsoever things are elevated should be real in your American democracy, and should grow into a disease, and take firm hold on you,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

then the life of even these great United States must inevitably suffer and be impaired more and more, until it perish."

Horace, in one of his great Odes, summed up, for us as well as for the Roman People, the philosophy of conduct for a nation, when he charged them with having left so long unvisited and neglected the altars of the gods:

> "Dis te minorem quod geris, imperas;
> Hinc omne principium, huc refer exitum."

All this may be scoffed at as preaching the counsels of perfection; but, if space permitted, such preaching could be abundantly reinforced by many quotations not alone from the writings of other authors, but from the writings of Mr. Roosevelt himself, who in stirring, eloquent words has taught and advocated much which he has discarded in his public life.

And when such preaching and the practices it enjoins shall be departed from by those holding high places of political trust among us, and the departure be not condemned, and when this preaching and these practices shall cease to furnish us with our rule for national conduct, we shall show as little solicitude for the best interests of the Republic as we should for our personal safety, if, in embarking on a ship for a long voyage, we threw overboard chart and compass as we dropped the pilot.

JOSEPH S. AUERBACH.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WORLD-POLITICS.

LONDON: BERLIN: ROME: WASHINGTON.

LONDON, *October, 1904.*

MR. BALFOUR has forgotten his Walpole. That supreme embodiment of political common sense advised his young men not to use the word "Never." Mr. Balfour has not only used the word but underlined and repeated it, and the chances greatly are that the issue of the event will confound his imprudence. Speaking at Edinburgh on October 3rd, the Prime Minister said:

"I am given to understand that the leader of the Irish party, of the Home Rule party, is giving wide currency in America to the view that the Irish party in the House of Commons is, after the next election, going to hold the balance between the two great historical parties into which we of the United Kingdom have been divided, and that by holding that balance he can exact from one or other of the contending factions the terms which may suit him and his friends. So far as I am concerned, so far as my colleagues are concerned, so far as the party with which I am connected is concerned, no such bargaining can, or ever will, take place. They may make what propositions they like, they may make what terms they choose with our political opponents; we, gentlemen, are not for sale."

Emphatic words, and received, I need hardly add, with rapturous cheers by the audience, and with hardly less satisfaction by the stalwarts of Ulster. But are they to be taken at their face value? If the Irish Nationalists, as they are extremely likely to be, are again in a position to hold the balance of power between Liberals and Conservatives, if neither party can take office without the support of Irish votes, is it "practical politics" to suppose that the Conservatives will for all time abandon power and consent to forego the prosecution of their cherished Protectionist policies, rather than come to terms with Mr. Redmond and his followers? I do not believe it is. Still less do I believe it when one of the leaders is a man like Mr. Chamberlain, who is tempera-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mentally incapable of allowing anything to stand between himself and whatever goal happens to be his immediate objective. The real importance of Mr. Balfour's declaration consists, not in its bearing on possible developments in the future but in its relation to the actual and immediate present. It is a sign that the Irish question is coming, even if it has not already come, once more to the forefront of English politics.

By the Irish question I do not mean the Home Rule question, or at any rate not the Gladstonian form of it. I think it may almost be taken as axiomatic that no party will again attempt to settle the Irish problem at a single comprehensive stroke. If Mr. Redmond expects that, he will assuredly be disappointed. The feeling of England has, with virtual unanimity, accepted it as one of the necessities of the case that what is compendiously known as "the Irish question" must henceforth be dealt with in piecemeal fashion, by gradual approaches along the line of practical utility, and by taking, as the phrase is, one point at a time. It is recognized by every one who is neither an Orangeman nor a leader-writer on "The Times" that in the last eighteen years the problem of Irish government has changed in many, if not most, of its essentials. I can but briefly enumerate some of the factors that have contributed to the change. In the first place, there has been the gift of local government. Through their county and district councils the Irish possess to-day as large a measure of domestic autonomy in purely local matters as the English or the Scotch. The experiment of Irish self-government has immensely justified itself, the people are at last and for the first time receiving a thorough training in administrative work, and with one or two exceptions, the Irish county councils are at least as efficient as the English county councils. The wretched and stupid taunt that the Irish are "unfit" for self-government will scarcely, I imagine, be heard again.

And, secondly, there is the Land Purchase Act of 1903. That Act, of course, has not settled the Land Question. But there can be little doubt that, on the whole, the results of the Act have so far fulfilled all reasonable expectations. The foundations of a new social order of peasant proprietors are being swiftly and securely laid, and that fact alone marks the downfall of a vicious and indefensible system that poisoned the whole social and economic life of Ireland. Thirdly, there has been that wonderful movement of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

self-help and agricultural cooperation instituted by Sir Horace Plunkett—a movement which, though working outside of politics, has done more, with the help of the Gaelic League, to revivify the true Ireland, to brace the Irish character and to inculcate thrift, responsibility and business-like habits among the peasants, than all the legislative enactments of the past twenty-five years. These measures and achievements, it is worth noting, together with the development of light railroads and the State-aided migration of the people from uneconomic to economic holdings, are all the work either of individual Unionists or of the Unionist Government. Unionism, in short, has ceased to be a merely passive policy of resistance and repression, and has broadened out into a mellower and more tolerant creed and, above all, into a programme of constructive amelioration. At the same time, Ireland is beginning to feel the stirrings of a really national spirit, and to evolve a new sense of the interdependence of all sections, creeds, interests and parties. The attitude of England towards Ireland has also vastly improved. There is not, so far as I can see, the least sign of a reaction in favor of Home Rule, nor are the two peoples even now within measurable distance of understanding one another. But English opinion on Irish problems and Irish demands is, if not repentant, at least free from bitterness; there is an obviously anxious desire to "do the right thing," a willingness to listen and to learn, a friendly effort to be tactful. It is a further sign of the times that the men of Ulster are as little well-disposed towards the present Unionist Government as the Nationalists themselves; they complain of being "betrayed," and they have more than once of late voted against the Ministry. It is yet more significant that Sir Antony MacDonnell, the permanent Under-Secretary of State for Ireland and the mainspring of the Irish administrative machine, is a Roman Catholic and an avowed Home-Ruler.

How far we have travelled from the days of 1886 may be judged by the programme of the newly born Irish Reform Association. This Association was founded at the end of last August by Lord Dunraven and a small body of Unionist landlords. They are the same men who in 1902 arranged that conference between landlords, tenants and politicians that afterwards bore such magnificent fruit in the Land Purchase Act. To say that they are "self-constituted" and that they "represent nobody but themselves" is technically true. But the opinions and the proposals of men who

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gave the initial propulsion to one of the greatest pieces of Irish legislation that have ever been enacted can hardly be dismissed as irresponsible. Personally, I am inclined to attach the greatest importance to them, not so much for their immediate and intrinsic practicality—on that it is too early to pass judgment—as for what they portend in the future and for the spirit and tendencies that animate them. Remember that these gentlemen are Unionists, and that they expressly reiterate their belief in the maintenance of the union between Great Britain and Ireland. In spite of this, they have put forward a unanimous report advocating the establishment of an Irish Financial Council, consisting of twelve nominated and twelve elected members, to control all purely Irish expenditure, and the setting up in Dublin of a statutory body to deal with the whole range of private Bill legislation for Ireland. That, to be sure, is not Home Rule or anything like it; but it is a long step towards devolution, and, coming as it does from convinced Unionists, I do not see how its significance can be overestimated. "The Times," at any rate, was sufficiently awake to its seriousness to attack it with all the fury of the old Parnell days; and Mr. Wyndham, the Irish Secretary, felt obliged to declare, "without reserve or qualification, that the Unionist Government is opposed to the multiplication of legislative bodies within the United Kingdom, whether in pursuance of the policy generally known as 'Home Rule for Ireland,' or in pursuance of the policy generally known as 'Home Rule all round.'" That, perhaps, was only to be expected; nor can Lord Dunraven and his friends have been much surprised to find their proposals denounced by most Unionists in Ireland, and accorded but a patronizing and lukewarm welcome by the Nationalists. Nevertheless, this tremendous fact remains, that a body of prominent and distinguished Unionists have gone on record as favoring the establishment of a subordinate legislature in Ireland for the management of purely Irish business. That fact, I feel confident, must ultimately come to be looked back upon as marking a turning-point in Irish history. It is the natural climax to the changes I have hurriedly sketched in Irish social and economic conditions, in the attitude of England towards Ireland and in the attitude of Ireland towards herself; and it coincides with the fast-ripening conviction on the part of Englishmen that the House of Commons is now physically incapable of handling properly the intolerable amount of business

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

it is called upon to deal with, that it has already degenerated into little more than an assembly for registering the decrees of the Government, and that it must, if it wishes to preserve its old efficiency, at any cost get rid of the masses of local business that encumber and clog its workings. Home Rule, let me again repeat, is not yet in sight; but a series of reforms that will check the utter wastefulness of the Dublin Castle system and give Ireland at least as much control over her private Bills as Scotland possesses, is something that the very near future may easily see.

The mystery of Mr. Balfour's opinions on Fiscal Reform and of his relations with Mr. Chamberlain grows deeper with every speech he makes. Mr. Balfour's policy is Retaliation. He wishes to recover for England her lost, or rather her obsolete, power of negotiating commercial treaties with foreign Governments on something like an equitable basis. At present, Great Britain, having agreed to forego the persuasive deterrent of a tariff duty, finds herself, when it comes to a matter of international bargaining, at a serious commercial and political disadvantage. This disadvantage Mr. Balfour hopes to wipe out by his policy of Retaliation. He asks for the authorization of the electorate to approach, let us say, Germany with this proposal: "Unless you agree to reduce your duties on articles A, B and C, we shall at once clap on a duty on articles D, E and F." Mr. Balfour evidently believes that the threat alone will be sufficient, and that the overwhelming importance which the Continent attaches to free access to the British market will, in itself, be enough to carry his point. What is to happen if the foreigner declines to come to terms, whether the duty will be imposed, and if it is, for how long and to what extent, is not very clear. Mr. Gladstone's experience between 1841 and 1844, "when the state of our tariff was such as to supply us with plenty of material for liberal offers," and when "we were anxiously and eagerly endeavoring to make tariff treaties with many foreign countries," was that failure attended every effort, and that it was doubtful "whether we advanced the cause of Free Trade by a single inch." Nor are the present-day Free-Traders without good warrant in believing that the policy of Retaliation, while honestly aiming at securing freer trade, will really end in the establishment of a Protective Tariff. However that may be, Mr. Balfour has taken his stand on Retaliation and, he has hitherto declined to advocate a policy which could only rest on the basis of a food-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tax. The situation has been immensely complicated by the fact that it is Mr. Chamberlain's programme, and not Mr. Balfour's, that is favored by the majority of the Unionist party, that Retaliation has been practically swamped by the bolder policy of Protection and Colonial Preference, and that Mr. Balfour, in order to keep his majority intact, has been forced to steer a wavering course between those who claim him as a Chamberlainite and those who insist that he is still a Free-Trader at heart. The nation has been bewildered in its attempt to decide whether, if it came to a pinch, Mr. Balfour would merge his policy in the Chamberlain programme, or would stand to his Retaliatory guns.

In his Edinburgh speech of October 3rd, Mr. Balfour made an apparently sincere attempt to resolve these doubts. The occasion was one of great tactical moment. The National Union of Conservative Associations will have held its annual meeting by the time this letter appears in print. At its last annual meeting, only Mr. Balfour's threat of resignation prevented the Caucus from declaring for the Chamberlain programme. What would happen at the approaching meeting? Would the delegates insist on giving a formal expression to their Chamberlainite convictions, and so repudiate the Prime Minister and still further widen the gap in the party? Mr. Balfour had to act with all the greater haste inasmuch as Mr. Chamberlain was engaged to speak on October 5th at Luton in Bedfordshire, and was then leaving the country for six weeks. In view of the meeting of the Conservative Associations an understanding between the two men and a public token of their entire agreement were imperative. Mr. Balfour, accordingly, hurriedly arranged to be entertained at dinner by the Scottish Conservative Club two days before Mr. Chamberlain was due to speak. In the course of his speech, the Prime Minister made two important announcements. He declared himself with unusual emphasis against the policy of Protection—"the policy," as he called it, "of supporting or creating home industries by raising home prices." He had never recommended that policy, directly or indirectly; he did not believe it to be an expedient policy under the existing circumstances of the country; and, though he would remain a supporter of the Conservative party, if it adopted Protection as part of its programme, he could not remain its leader. His second announcement bore on the issue of Colonial Preference. "It surely is wrong," he said, and here every Englishman agrees

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with him, "that we should now be using, voluntarily or involuntarily, those Imperial sentiments as they exist in our great self-governing Colonies as counters in a political game, and that from one platform and another in this country we should be throwing charges that the Colonies want this, that the Colonies do not want it, that the Colonies are earnestly desirous of a closer union, fiscal and otherwise, with this country, or, again, that the Colonies have no such desire and no such wish, that their one aim is to be left alone." To rescue the Empire from the political cockpit, Mr. Balfour declared that, if returned to power after the next election, he would summon a conference of representatives from the Colonies and India; that the delegates to this conference should be absolutely uncommitted by any special views or instructions; that they should freely discuss whether "this ideal of fiscal union" was commendable, and, if so, how it could be carried out; and that whatever plan they finally agreed upon should be submitted to the electorates as well as the Parliaments of the Mother Country and the Colonies for their acceptance or rejection. All this, as Mr. Balfour said, would take time. It certainly would. Indeed, it would take so much time, and its issue would be so delightfully uncertain, that Mr. Balfour's proposal might well be regarded as an attempt to shelve the whole matter indefinitely.

Two days later, on October 5th, Mr. Chamberlain spoke, and there was the keenest interest to see how he would receive Mr. Balfour's manifesto. The Protectionist journals had handled it with singular unanimity. They all agreed that Mr. Balfour's opposition to Protection meant nothing and was no more than "an innocent device"; and they all agreed in welcoming his proposed Colonial Conference as an immense step in the direction of Mr. Chamberlain's views. Mr. Chamberlain himself may have inspired these utterances; at any rate, in his Luton speech he adopted and repeated them. He stated that, like Mr. Balfour, he was entirely opposed to the Protection of fifty years ago—quite ignoring the fact that Mr. Balfour declared himself opposed to any Protection, to Protection in principle, to Protection as a policy. He went on to congratulate himself on Mr. Balfour's conversion to the idea of Colonial Preferences, and found "only one blemish" in his plan—namely, that it would require two General Elections to carry it out. This seems an unimportant shortcoming, but it is really vital. If Mr. Chamberlain can induce Mr. Balfour to con-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tent himself with one election, then he has the entire Unionist party squarely and officially committed to the policy of Protection and Colonial Preference. The "Westminster Gazette" has summed up the situation with its usual clarity:

"Mr. Balfour desires, if the Unionist party is returned to power at the next election, to have a Conference at which nobody will be committed to anything and everybody free to discuss everything. After that, if the Conference recommends food taxes, there is to be a General Election before that proposal is carried into effect. We believe the idea of the uncommitted Conference to be impracticable, but that is not the point. The point is that Mr. Balfour intends by this device to keep the Unionist party free from the proposal to tax food at the next election. Mr. Chamberlain, on the contrary, by substituting one election for two, would make that proposal *the* issue at the next election, and compel the Unionist party to ask here and now for a mandate which would enable it to tax food in the next Parliament. The difference is vital, and if Mr. Balfour concedes the point he concedes everything."

Such is the stage we have so far reached in this subterranean struggle, if struggle it be, between Mr. Balfour and Mr. Chamberlain. There are moments when the issue of Free Trade or Protection is overshadowed by the intentness of the nation upon the fluctuating relations of these two Unionist leaders. Are they really opposed to one another, or are they playing into one another's hands with the help of a private code? It is over a year since that question was first propounded, and even to-day it would be easy to collect at least half a dozen irreconcilable and equally emphatic answers to it. The meeting of the Conservative Associations at the end of October may throw some light on the problem, but I scarcely expect it. Indeed, the net result of the recent speech-making is to convince the Free-Traders and Protectionists in the Unionist party that each is right. The Unionist Free-Traders, with the important exception of "The Spectator," were never more sure than they are at this moment that Mr. Balfour is really with them in their opposition to Protection and Colonial Preference. The Chamberlainites have never before claimed Mr. Balfour so publicly as their friend and ally. The country, meanwhile, suspecting chicanery somewhere, and being unable to say precisely where, is palpably tiring of both Mr. Balfour and Mr. Chamberlain, and has quite made up its mind to vote for neither.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BERLIN, *October, 1904.*

As the war cloud in the Far East gathers in intensity—so that the end seems more obscure and more remote than ever—European politics tend to become clear. Not that international politics are one whit less complex now than they were at any time since last February, but rather that the general feeling of uncertainty, sapping initiative, which prevailed in European Chancelleries in the opening months of hostilities, has given way to a more comprehensive grasp of the situation; while things, as so often happens, have partly righted themselves with time—which is perhaps the best adjuster of all. And already the war has had positive results. It has accentuated the bond of interest, where present, between nations: attenuated the artificial. European statesmen have had time, and have begun, to recover from the paralyzing shock caused by the outbreak of war, and in the subterranean runnels of diplomacy renewed activity is noticeable. The struggle for political supremacy in the East has exercised its inevitable effect upon the Powers of the West, who have been constrained to show their hands. Governments and peoples are thus in a state of political transition, in still rather tentative form, it may be, but, none the less, diverging or converging in unmistakable manner, and along unmistakable lines. Looking at Europe to-day, we find that the war, on the one hand, has brought about a marked political *rapprochement* between the Governments of Germany and Russia, and, on the other, has imparted a fresh stimulus to the popularity of a common-sense understanding between the peoples of England and France. Nor is there anything to cause surprise in this. It is, surely, natural enough that, in a war between an Asiatic people saturated in Western civilization and a Western state steeped in Asiatic tradition, the free peoples of two such free countries as England and France should find common cause for agreement, while the two foremost living exemplars of military despotism should see in the victorious issue of Russian arms in the East a fitting reason for mutual rejoicing. What more natural than that the "Admiral of the West" should stand by the "Admiral of the East" in the hour of need? For, though Germans individually and collectively are pronouncedly pro-Japanese, yet their voices are no more able to make themselves felt in the direction of their country's affairs than the groans of the stricken, the needy

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and oppressed within the realms of "All the Russias" can touch the heart of the "Little Father." Thus insensibly the old grouping of the Powers in Europe has become modified. Europe seems to be falling almost insensibly into two perfectly natural halves: the West as opposed to the East, the free peoples of Democracy and Progress as against the mailed forces of Autocracy and Reaction. And Germany, as the centre Power, is the central influence for good or for evil.

Now, since the day when Mr. Chamberlain glibly spoke of an Anglo-German Alliance and Count von Bülow informed him that no such political combination was contemplated by Germany, it has become increasingly evident to all students of European affairs that friendship with her "Eastern neighbor" was, as Bismarck always insisted it must be, the end and object of Germany's diplomacy. This is not the place to recapitulate the various reasons, historical, military, political, dynastic and even social, that in their "cumulative force" go far to justify Bismarckian policy towards Russia; nor is it germane to our subject to inquire into the general principles regulating the policies of the two great military monarchies of Northern Europe. In spite of jars and friction in the past, of modern Pan-Slavism and Pan-Germanism, both Germany and Russia have, ever since the foundation of Russian hegemony, felt in turn the need of one another, and no development in all international politics is more natural than the bond of interest and sympathy that now links the Governments of Germany and Russia together. Now, more than ever, the dynasties of Russia and Germany are maintained as living institutions chiefly by what is known in Central Europe as "the monarchical principle," which is based, humanly speaking, on the popular faith in the infallibility of the Sovereign, but actually rests on force and despotic military rule. The police régime of Russia exists also to a large extent, though in more modified form, in modern Germany; and, if Germany is the nursery of organized Socialism, Russia is regarded as the great barrier to "revolutionary ideas," which, in the eyes of the powerful privileged and aristocratic classes, range over the whole gamut of what is generally understood by modern reform. And as personal government in Germany, owing to the difference in the personalities of the respective Sovereigns, has reached a point far exceeding the commonly supposed omnipotent rule of the Tsar, it is quite in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

harmony with the existing order of things to find the country that gave birth to Goethe and Kant in sympathetic communion in the twentieth century with the spirit reflected in the system of a man such as Plehve. The dead palsy of public opinion in Germany and Russia finds its natural counterpoise in militarism and absolute control by the Sovereign; and the present *rapprochement* between those two countries is as much the personal work, in his own interests, of the German Emperor, as the outcome of a fortuitous, and for Germany unexpectedly fortunate, combination of circumstances in the higher interests of German "*Weltpolitik.*" This *rapprochement* is the great feature in international politics at the moment, and with this feature all European statesmen will in the future have to reckon. For the most egotistic, self-interested and, therefore, the most potential, Alliance in Europe to-day is unquestionably that, signed or unsigned, contracted between the Emperors of Russia and Germany. And the greater the embarrassments and trials of Russia, the greater her loss of prestige and power, the more necessary will the material and moral aid and support of Germany become to her, and the greater her debt of acknowledgment.

A great deal has been written and said during the past month about this understanding between Russia and Germany, mainly because "The Times" drew public attention to the matter by publishing a closely reasoned document to show how the understanding had been brought about, and to prove that a "secret agreement" actually existed. Though similar statements had not unfrequently been seen in print before, and people in close touch with German politics had long ago foreseen that an *entente* was inevitable, the appearance of that statement in the columns of "The Times," supported by a weighty introductory article, created a sensation on the Continent, and immediately led to an international press wrangle. Naturally, the German Government was somewhat annoyed at what it styled the "perfidious onslaughts of the London City organ"; and, naturally, too, the duty devolved upon the Press bureau of the German Foreign Office to assail "The Times," and issue denials. Both these things it did zealously. On September 15th the "*Koelnische Zeitung*" repudiated all idea of an understanding between Germany and Russia; and the Foreign Office organ, "The North-German Gazette," quickly followed with an equally crisp denial. The controversy,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

however, continued, until "The Daily Graphic" one morning put an end to the pother for the time being by declaring that, in Russian official circles, no credence was attached to the statement. This announcement was circulated in Germany, and through Germany over a great portion of the Continent, as being of the highest political significance; and possibly it might have been if the version circulated had been the correct one. But, as a matter of fact, the German Continental version made the denial emanate, not from "Russian sources," but "from a quarter in close touch with the English Foreign Office"—which, of course, put a totally false complexion upon the value of the source, and made it look as if Lord Lansdowne felt personally affronted because "The Times" laid claim to exclusive information. Then there followed further denials, and Herr von Brandt, former German Ambassador at Pekin, expatiated, in the "*Vossische Zeitung*," upon the malignant nature of the press. The question whether a secret agreement has been concluded between the two Powers, or whether, indeed, anything in the shape of a verbal or written document exists between them, must be left to "The Times" to answer. It is difficult, even for the experienced eye, to draw any reliable conclusions from the tangle of semi-official statements—and misstatements—that appear in the "well-informed" organs of the German press on occasions of this kind; but there seems to be some ground for assuming that "The North-German Gazette" was technically correct when it pointed out, with unconscious humor, that the German Emperor and the Tsar, on the occasion of their last meeting, only referred to the Far-Eastern situation in the course of casual conversation during a game of billiards. What an "*aperçu*" that gives into the minds and ways of kings! That game of billiards stands out now historically in the dim light of the past, and we shall not forget it. It is a scene that Carlyle would have rejoiced in, and it might even yet be depicted upon canvas by the octogenarian Hohenzollern painter, Menzel. Moreover, it is, probably, perfectly true—strange though it may seem, when it is remembered that the two great autocrats of Europe met to confer together on the eve of so momentous a crisis, and that for that purpose their privacy was guarded by a veritable army of Russian and German police spies, soldiers, and constables. It might be instructive to press the Foreign Office organ further and elicit the information who won that game of billiards, but

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

our impression is that the Tsar won the billiards and the Emperor the other game. In any case, whether it was over the billiard-table, or elaborately done with ink on paper, both Tsar and Emperor "signed to that bond." From that day onward, the "benevolent neutrality" of Germany took form and substance, and both countries were freed from a long-standing cause of obsession. For the first time since the proclamation of the German Empire at Versailles, Russia was enabled to denude the whole of her Western frontier garrisons of troops, and even to dismantle some of the fortresses, in order to send siege-guns to the theatre of war; while Germany stood sentinel at the frontier, turning back deserters from the Russian army there, hunting up recruits here, vagrants* and emigrants, and delivering them all over to the mercies of the Russian police.

The sale of four valuable steamers, described in the "*Taschenbuch der Kriegsflotten*" for 1904 as "auxiliary cruisers" of the German Navy, was unquestionably an act of unusual benevolence on the part of a neutral power; nor has any serious denial been given to the reiterated statement of the German press that "parts" of torpedo-boats were being forwarded to Russia. Then the safe haven of Kiao-chao was made the objective for a rush for safety by the Russian Port Arthur fleet; and, as Prince Ukhtomsky has fallen into disgrace for not having obeyed orders and brought his ships in the wake of the "Tsarevitch" into that friendly but neutral port, great importance must have been attributed in Russia to the successful issue of the sortie. Indeed, the "benevolent neutrality" of Germany has been throughout of incalculable value to Russia, of far greater service to her than any benefit she may have derived from the formal Treaty of Alliance with France: who, with England, has been engaged in keeping the ring, leaving the task of holding the sponge to the Chancellery at Berlin. And concerning coal the same complaisance and benevolence are noticeable. Here, again, "The North-German Gazette" assumed white raiments of innocence, and protested that the coaling of foreign ships was a "private enterprise conducted by the contractors, and not inconsistent with the strict neutrality of a state." But that catholic principle did not prevent the Government from refusing permission to German firms

* *Vide* the account of the treatment meted out to Russian emigrants in Germany, recently published in the "*Vorwärts*."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to supply the Boers with munitions; and, since M. Hutin published in the "*Echo de Paris*" a letter written by Herr Diedrichsen, of Kiel, brother of Rear-Admiral Diedrichsen, and Russian Consul to boot, offering to supply Admiral Rozhdestvensky with "any quantity" of coal, the German semi-official press has issued no further *démentis*. Nor has it seen fit to give any denial to the persistent reports in various German newspapers that a large number of ships laden with coal "are lying off Ems and elsewhere for the use of the Baltic fleet." In view of these known facts, it would seem little to the purpose to speculate as to whether Germany has or has not formally concluded a secret agreement with Russia. The "reinsurance" trick, so often practised by Germany, has quite lost its novelty, and only those utterly unacquainted with the policy of the "Wilhelmstrasse" could affect the slightest surprise if, in the near future, Count von Bülow were to announce in the Reichstag that he had "reinsured" the Empire with Russia in accordance with the approved policy of the great Chancellor. It is a perfectly legitimate policy; and, now that the peoples of England and Germany have grown somewhat estranged—which is a cause of some anxiety to the German Government—it is also a perfectly natural one. The personal efforts of the German Emperor to "reinsure" his country with England having failed as egregiously as have German diplomatic attempts to "butter" the English press, the German Government immediately perceived the necessity of having a reliable friend somewhere in the world; and, as Russia happened to be in sore need of support, it was easy enough for Germany to tender her good offices, and place her resources at the service of Russia, who, nothing loath, readily acquiesced in the bargain.

Thus what might have taken years of sedulous cultivation to bring about has been effected by the natural swing of the pendulum, almost, as it were, without any effort at all. It is the great political achievement of the Emperor William's reign, which, if signally full of hope and promise, has been curiously barren in positive result. For the Triple Alliance is not what it was when the young Emperor ascended the throne, nor can Germany's relations with England in any way be said to have improved since that date; rather is the contrary the case. Moreover, the ambitious oversea expansionist policy of the Emperor has met with unexpected, and, it would seem, almost insuperable

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

difficulties in the shape of the "Monroe Doctrine" on the one side, and Russian, British, French and Japanese "Imperialism" on the other. The one positive creation of the Emperor William II. is the German Navy. The growing economic rivalry between England and Germany, together with German Anglophobia and the shifty policy of Germany wherever and whenever Great Britain is concerned, have driven the two most vital peoples in Europe apart; the one into the arms of Russia, the other to make common cause with the civilization of modern France. As before said, the result is the "benevolent neutrality" of Germany to-day, and the dislocation of the old grouping of European Powers.

At this moment Germany is naturally desirous to preserve the outward semblance and forms, at any rate, of a neutral state, and particularly as the success of Japanese arms on land has far exceeded her expectations; and opinion throughout Germany grows that the end is not yet within calculable distance. The sending of Prince Anton of Hohenzollern, who is a distant relative of the Emperor, to the Mikado, though nominally in the capacity of a military attaché, is one of these little acts of political courtesy and prescience in which German diplomacy excels. His mission to Japan is a precisely similar one to that entrusted to Prince Henry some years ago, when a certain tension existed between the peoples of Germany and America. Prince Anton would appear to have been fairly successful, though the presence of a German Prince in the Japanese capital does not seem to have prevented Admiral Togo from keeping a certain number of ships off Chifu on the lookout for any chance Russian ship making a second dash for liberty to a neighboring port. There will probably be less heard now about German acts of benevolence, for one reason because, as Gretchen explained to Faust, "she had already done so much that there was hardly anything left for her to do"; and, in the second place, because it is not within the purpose of Germany to hamper her future elasticity of movement in the rôle she confidently hopes to play in the final adjustment, by revealing her cards prematurely, and rousing unnecessary resentment. But, when the hour for diplomatic action arrives, all the weight of German influence will be cast on the side of Russia, to preserve for the stricken "colossus" what it may be possible to obtain for her. For the predominance of Japanese power in the Far

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

East would be fatal to the realization of some of Germany's most ambitious and cherished schemes of aggrandizement, and she has no intention to stand idly by and see Japan fatten on the spoils of victory. The "Alliance" with Russia will then prove to be a very real thing. If the "Yellow Peril" bogey fails to achieve its object, other "perils" will be discovered. Germany would like best to see a Russo-German-English *condominium* controlling the affairs of the East, because that would ensure to Germany her place, enable Russia to recuperate at the expense of Japan, and keep England in a minority in the Tripartite Council until Russia and Germany felt strong enough to oust her altogether.

ROME, *October, 1904.*

A GENERAL rehearsal of revolution has been tried in Italy. This is the definition given, especially in Germany, to the attempt at a general strike in the Peninsula in the second half of September. The definition is on the whole incorrect, and the incorrectness is due partly to ignorance of local conditions in the young kingdom, partly to that diplomatic ability by which the press in Germany, even of the Opposition, indeed very often that in a larger degree, is used for political purposes in foreign affairs. In the present case, the spectre of revolution was a good string to pull from Berlin for certain directing circles and classes in Italy, which, in the eyes of the Emperor William and his Chancellor, have lately assumed a too independent attitude. This, however, should not be taken in the sense of denying a considerable gravity to the agitation which troubled for a week all the large towns with the exception of Florence.

On September 4th, at Buggerru, in Sardinia, some strikers surrounded and so threateningly attacked a detachment of soldiers, sent to the spot merely to maintain order, that the troops were obliged to fire in self-defence, killing two workmen. A few days later, at Castelluzzo, in Sicily, a non-commissioned officer of the Carabineers, without any instructions from his superiors, broke in upon a meeting of a peasant league to obtain the rules and a list of the members. On encountering resistance, he ordered his men to fire and they shot one of the peasants dead. The Government, even before this fact was generally known, and therefore without pressure either from political parties or from

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

public opinion, had the non-commissioned officer and his men arrested, to be tried by the ordinary courts. In both cases, no responsibility could be traced to the Cabinet; but the extreme parties raised the cry of a unanimous movement of the proletariat. The agitation was kept *sub rosâ* for some time, merely showing that it existed through the meetings of their most fiery leaders and through articles in the revolutionary press.

Meanwhile, the King was expecting a child, and great rejoicings were being prepared should the infant prove to be the so ardently desired heir to the throne. The little Prince of Piedmont came to satisfy these ambitions late on the evening of September 15th, and the next day, almost two weeks after the incidents in Sardinia and Sicily, popular indignation exploded in an order issued by the *Camera del Lavoro* (Labor Exchange) of Milan—composed for the greater part of Anarchists—which proclaimed a general strike throughout the country. This order was immediately carried into effect, not only in Milan itself, but also in Turin and Genoa and in smaller towns of Lombardy, Piedmont and Liguria, so that the Castle of Racconigi, where the royal family was staying and where the birth of the Crown-Prince had occurred, found itself suddenly surrounded by a vast mob of strikers. Shortly thereafter, Rome joined the movement, although unwillingly, from a sentiment of solidarity; and the example of the capital was followed by Venice, Naples, Messina and other less important centres. At Milan, the movement assumed an anarchist character; at Genoa, that of open rebellion, accompanied by the destruction of railway tracks and the cutting of telegraph and telephone wires, to isolate the town; at Turin and Venice, that of vandalism; while at Naples, there rose to the top the scum of the *lazzaroni,* who even used barricades to prevent the police and troops from reestablishing order.

The moment had been excellently chosen for a movement of this kind, the Government having comparatively few soldiers at its disposal, as the three years' service of the conscripts had just expired, and the new recruits were not yet under arms, while the larger part of the troops under the colors had not reentered their garrisons from the manœuvres. The day on which the strike broke out at Rome, when a great meeting was held—announced to be of 50,000 men, although in reality the number did not exceed 15,000—the authorities found that the capital had

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

only 3,000 soldiers available, so that the artillery also was employed to quell disturbances and charge the rioters, when, after listening to inflammatory speeches at the meeting, they attempted to invade the centre of the city with hostile intentions. Venice was in an even worse position, the prefect having at his disposal only 380 soldiers, or one for about every 500 inhabitants. At Genoa, the need of reinforcements was so urgent that commander Briggs, of the American warship "Baltimore," which happened to be in port, offered the prefect to land 350 men to help put down the rioters. The offer was courteously declined, but four Italian warships were sent to Genoa, which landed 2,000 men, while torpedo-boats and destroyers were employed to protect the railway along the Mediterranean coast, which was most seriously threatened. Notwithstanding this, the instructions sent by the Government to the authorities were to do all in their power to avoid using force in repressing the strike, and to recommend officers, soldiers and police to be patient and to endure almost anything rather than use their arms, asking this more as a patriotic sacrifice than as the performance of a duty.

The Cabinet and Signor Giolitti, who, besides being Premier, is Minister of the Interior, were accused by the Opposition of weakness, indeed were almost suspected of treason, as, it was said, repression at any cost should have been adopted when the Anarchist leaders of the strike, dragging after them Socialists, Republicans and Radicals, who joined them from political cowardice, pushed things so far as to interfere with the free working of the press, to leave the cities in total darkness, to close all the hotels, and to hinder the nursing and the feeding of the patients in the hospitals and even to prevent the burial of the dead. Signor Giolitti, however, has proved that he knows Italy and his fellow countrymen better than any one else. Less important movements than this, some of his predecessors—notably Signor Crispi, the Marquis di Rudinì and General Pelloux—by the use of strenuously repressive measures, have transformed into revolutionary attempts, such as the rising of the *Fasci* (Land Leagues) in Sicily in 1893-4, the rebellion among the marble-cutters of Carrara in 1894, the bloody riots of Milan in 1898, and the state of active discontent during the entire Pelloux administration, which seemed the prelude to civil war. On these occasions, besides the people killed and wounded by the troops, which in Milan

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

amounted to several hundreds, besides those sent to suffer the horrors of "forced domicile"—Crispi in 1894 having condemned 2,000 to this penalty in Sicily alone—there were almost whole parties, leaders and followers, sentenced by courts-martial, which, in the atmosphere of resentment prevalent at the moment, lacked the serenity and the impartiality of the ordinary courts, and offered no such guarantee of justice as the normal judicial procedure affords. After the movements in Sicily, Carrara and Milan, large numbers of people were thus condemned to sentences ranging from one year to imprisonment for life, thus making them political martyrs, and later rendering necessary an almost general amnesty through the pressure of public opinion. This state of ferment was especially due to the efforts of the different Cabinets to suppress by force all propaganda in favor of the economic amelioration of the lower classes, and to their policy of siding with the employers in all conflicts between capital and labor. In this policy the successive Ministries were supported by a large majority in the country, especially in the South, where the middle and upper classes are still impregnated with feudal principles, by which they have been imbued through many centuries of reactionary governments. When, over twenty years ago, the peasants of the Venetian provinces initiated their leagues of resistance, aiming at the attainment of higher wages and shorter hours of work, such disorders ensued, in consequence of the authorities supporting the landowners, that it seemed Italy was on the verge of a new Jacquerie. The Government then in power was inexorable in quenching the movement. It spread terror throughout the provinces, and arrested over 2,000 of the best-known agitators, some through blank orders which were filled in after the arrests were made, as in the worst days of the *lettres de cachet*. Such a system did not succeed in suppressing the organization of the peasants, whose leagues now number over 1,500, with nearly half a million members. They have, indeed, acquired so much power as to be able to dictate and impose conditions.

Signor Giolitti was the first statesman since the country was united to proclaim entire liberty of combination, organization and strike for working-men, laborers and peasants; but at the same time he pledged himself to guarantee liberty of work, adopting practically the principle of Waldeck Rousseau, that "*le droit de travailler d'un seul ouvrier est aussi respectable que le droit de*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

*tous les autres de cesser le travail."** It is difficult to imagine what would have happened if, in the recent period of economic evolution and general revival of the working-men, Italy had had one of the old-style Ministries, which, by their policy, would certainly have transformed the economic movement into political agitation, conspiracy and rebellion.

Since 1900 the Peninsula has gone through the vastest and most pacific of these movements ever recorded in its history, there having been, without counting the last general strike, over 3,000 strikes in which 1,500,000 workers participated, with the result that advantages were gained by the workmen which are estimated at 20,000,000 dollars yearly. All this was obtained without violence, with the exception of a few conflicts between strikers and troops, caused by excesses on the part of the people, or by the impulsiveness of the soldiers, as at Buggerru and Castelluzzo.

Signor Giolitti, having inaugurated and constantly followed for four years a policy of complete liberty in the struggles between capital and labor, wished to carry on that policy even under the unfavorable conditions of the late general strike, which was attempted, not certainly for the rights of the working-man or for the amelioration of his economic position, but in the hope of causing such a conflagration as would overthrow the Ministry, which is Liberal and impartial at the same time. The Premier did not deceive himself as to the risks he was running, and the damage which might result from his course; but he thought that from a different policy much greater evils would arise. He must have remembered what happened, after the unification of Italy, in Romagna, the district which was noted for its intransigeant republicanism, and which was in a state of continuous convulsion because the people wished to have the bands play Garibaldi's hymn, which was considered the republican anthem, whilst the authorities forbade it; the result was that such violent manifestations ensued that conflicts with police and troops were frequent and fatal. At last, a prefect was sent there who, seeing no harm in having a hymn played to the strains of which most of the victorious battles of Italian Independence had been fought, ordered that every band, military or civilian, should invariably begin and end its programme with the hymn of Garibaldi, and that,

* "The right of a single working-man to work is as much to be respected as that of all the others to stop working."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in addition, the hymn should be played as many times as the public desired. It is needless to say that, in a few weeks, even the most rabid republicans had lost their ardor for the disputed hymn, and peace settled over the countryside. By the same system, the present Premier has, more or less, cured the excesses which accompanied the strike. Whilst sanguinary repression would have united all the subversive and antimonarchical elements in a supreme attempt, which might even have resulted in revolution, the policy of leaving them to themselves has brought about a split, a reciprocal condemnation, and a competition between Socialists, Republicans and Radicals in disclaiming all responsibility for the excesses indulged in during the general strike. These excesses have aroused universal indignation, and will provide the best platform for the Government at the next elections, and the most effective obstacle to the return of several of the Deputies of the Extreme Left.

Through imperfect news or interested views, however, the situation may have been judged differently abroad, especially in Germany, where the feeling of independence of the Central Empires, which in late years has gradually grown in the Italian kingdom, cannot be looked upon with satisfaction. The Triple Alliance was signed in May, 1882; and Prince Bismarck, immediately after the meeting of September, 1884, at Skiernievice had no hesitation in concluding the famous defensive accord with Russia, which remained a secret for many years. Now that Italy has, on the other hand, reestablished friendly relations with France, concluding an understanding as to their reciprocal rights and duties in the Mediterranean, and an arbitration treaty, signs of jealousy are shown in Berlin, although, contrary to Prince Bismarck's policy, Italy has made no secret of the negotiations. What seems to disturb Berlin even more is a growing tendency towards intimate relations between Russia and Italy, notwithstanding the strong sympathy of the Italian people for Japan, and the hisses promised the Tsar last year, which prevented his projected visit to Rome. The friendship between Italy and Russia, which Germany opposes, fearing it will render more difficult the attainment of her desire for a monopoly of influence with the Muscovite Empire, is brought about by the relations which have long existed between the Houses of Romanoff and Savoy, the former having always assisted the latter at its most critical moments. To recall

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

only relatively recent events: in the eighteenth century, when King Charles Emmanuel IV. was driven from Piedmont by Napoleon I., the Tsar, Paul I., showed him the greatest sympathy, even sending Prince Czartoryski, as Minister Plenipotentiary, to Florence, where the Sovereign of Savoy had taken refuge, although Charles Emmanuel was then without a square inch of territory. In later times, when Charles Albert, great-grandfather of the present King, fell into disgrace as Regent of Sardinia, because he was too Liberal, he also took refuge in Florence, where he was met by the Russian representative, who had been instructed to do everything possible in his behalf in the name of Alexander I.

In the attitude of Russia towards the House of Savoy, a continuity of policy can easily be seen, aiming at a cardinal interest of St. Petersburg, which consists in finding allies against Austria. Piedmont, for historical, racial, political and topographical reasons, was designed to fight Austria, which possessed the best Italian provinces. In other words, Piedmont was then in Italy, with regard to Russia, what now in the Balkans is Montenegro, which fights, in its turn, Austrian influence and favors Russia, in the hope that the day will come in which, with the assistance of St. Petersburg, all the Servians will be united under the flag waving at Cettinje. Of course, the presence of a Montenegrin Queen at the Quirinal is not certainly the last or the least important link of the chain which may bind Russia and Italy. The preoccupation of Berlin, which brought about the recent meeting at Homburg between Count von Bülow and Signor Giolitti, is sufficiently justified when one considers that there is much more cordiality in the relations of Italy with England, France and Russia, than in those with her ally Austria. When the Triple Alliance was renewed, in June, 1902, Italy made a condition that she should be authorized to communicate its clauses to France, to convince that country that the Peninsula had not pledged itself to any hostile combination against the Republic. M. Delcassé was much pleased, and lost no time in officially stating to the Chamber, that, given the Triple Alliance as it now is, Italy can "neither be the instrument of, nor a party to, an aggression against France."

Among the many suppositions put forward with regard to the Homburg meeting there is one which is, perhaps, not far from

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the truth. While Signor Giolitti went there to give assurances of a closer union with Germany in Italy's foreign policy, he has requested the good offices of Berlin to induce the Pope, at the next general elections, to at least tacitly allow the Clericals to vote, in order to insure the complete defeat of the extreme parties, the triumph of which, if dangerous to present institutions in the Peninsula, would certainly not be advantageous to the Church. It is no longer a secret that Pius X. was elected through Italy's inducing Germany to bring it about that Austria should veto the candidature of Cardinal Rampolla, who, besides being eminently Francophile, would have been an anti-Italian and anti-German Pontiff. Because of these circumstances and of the recent rupture between France and the Pope, no other country, perhaps, is now so influential at the Vatican as Germany, and a desire expressed by the Kaiser will certainly be considered by the Holy See.

WASHINGTON, *October, 1904.*

IT is not surprising that the outcome of the Presidential election now close at hand should be awaited with keen interest, not to say anxiety, by the representatives of foreign Powers at Washington. In view of the President's acts, and of his avowed opinions, they can forecast to a considerable extent the course which he is likely to take with reference to our foreign relations, in case he should continue to occupy the White House up to March 4, 1909. From the St. Louis Platform, from Judge Parker's speech of acceptance, from his letter of acceptance and from his later utterances, they are enabled also to obtain some light upon the consequences of a Democratic victory, so far as the management of our foreign affairs is concerned. It is worth while to note how, in the judgment of these diplomatists, their respective countries will be affected by the issue of the contest which will close on November 8th. As was to be expected, the opinions of the spokesmen of the great foreign Powers differ materially from those expressed by delegates of the Latin-American republics. It will, therefore, be convenient to consider the views of the former separately.

To begin with Great Britain, it is certain that well-informed and far-sighted servants of the British Foreign Office desire ardently the election of Mr. Roosevelt, especially since the an-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nouncement, which is understood to have emanated directly from the White House, that Mr. John Hay has been requested, and has consented, to remain Secretary of State in the event of a Republican triumph at the ballot-box. What England wants is an assurance that no incident will disturb the exceptionally cordial relation, amounting almost to informal cooperation, which has existed between her and the United States during the McKinley-Roosevelt Administrations. The knowledge that such a relation existed has exerted an unmistakable influence at St. Petersburg and Berlin, and, doubtless, has had much to do with the substantial concessions made by Russia as regards the articles which ought to be excluded from the category of absolutely contraband merchandise. Thanks to the concurrent representations made by the British Foreign Office and our State Department, it is now settled, so far as Russia's acquiescence can settle it, that food products shipped from a neutral country in a neutral ship to a belligerent are exempt from seizure, provided they cannot be proved to be destined for a belligerent fleet or army, or for a blockaded port. Of course, Russia's agreement binds only herself, and might not be accepted as a controlling precedent by another Continental Power; but, in view of the impressive demonstration that the United States and England recognize a joint interest in the matter, and are determined to safeguard it, it has become improbable that even a Continental coalition against England would venture to treat food as absolutely contraband. It is manifest that no more momentous service could have been rendered to Great Britain. The success of Mr. Roosevelt, however, is hoped for in the United Kingdom, not only on the score of favors received, but because the accession of a Democratic Chief Magistrate would be witnessed with some apprehension. A curious change has come over the attitude of the British people toward our Democratic party. Before the Civil War, British manufacturers had good reason to acclaim the ascendency of the Democracy, because it was the party of free trade. The tremendous stimulus imparted to the importation of British products into the United States during the fourteen years which followed the Walker low tariff of 1846 is still remembered vividly and longingly in Great Britain. Since the enactment of the Wilson-Gorman tariff, however, British manufacturers have ceased to believe that much advantage would accrue to them from a Democratic victory, even though it should involve not only control of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Executive, but also preponderance in both Houses of Congress. On the other hand, British statesmen cannot be expected to forget that it was Thomas Jefferson who shut British manufactures out of the United States by an embargo, that it was disciples of Jefferson who made the War of 1812, and that it was a Democratic President who issued the Venezuela Message.

There is, undoubtedly, a startling difference between the view of the Monroe Doctrine taken by Mr. Cleveland and that exemplified in Mr. Roosevelt's attitude toward the British and German occupation of La Guayra and Puerto Cabello, and subsequently expressed by him in his Cuban letter. It is true that Mr. Cleveland had beheld without protest the British occupation of a Nicaraguan seaport, but that was because the coercion administered was intended simply to exact reparation for a glaring public wrong. It was not intended to assure the payment of an ordinary debt arising out of contract. The occupation of La Guayra and Puerto Cabello, on the other hand, was designed, ostensibly and partly, to secure redress for notorious breaches of international law, but, really and principally, to enforce the recognition of obligations imposed by transactions into which foreign creditors had freely entered. Mr. Cleveland's Venezuela Message, moreover, was based expressly on the ground that England's assumption of a right arbitrarily to determine the boundary of British Guiana might amount, practically, to so serious a dismemberment of territory as would materially "affect the destiny" of a Latin-American republic, and thus violate the terms in which the Monroe Doctrine had been propounded by its author. Yet there is no doubt that, when we permitted a large part of the customs revenue of Venezuela to be confiscated by foreign Powers for an indefinite period, in order to enforce the payment of debts arising out of contract, we connived at an act which may materially "affect the destiny" of that commonwealth. Mr. Roosevelt, indeed, is disposed, if his Cuban letter has been construed correctly, to go much farther than mere passive acquiescence in a process the outcome of which might be to reduce a Latin-American republic to the condition of Egypt. He is understood to have intimated that, if our southern neighbors should fail to pay their debts, he would himself undertake a disciplinary function, which can only mean that he would take charge of their revenues, and apply them to the proper ends. Such an extension of the Monroe Doctrine is, of course,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

highly acceptable to foreign creditors, and they would be ungrateful if they failed to applaud the prospect of Mr. Roosevelt's election.

There is another cogent reason for the desire of the British Foreign Office to see Mr. Roosevelt remain the President of the United States. He is pledged to the retention of the Philippines for an indefinite period, and, so long as we keep a fleet and an army in the Far East, we are in a position to cooperate effectively with Great Britain in maintaining the "Open Door" in China. Should we evacuate the islands, they would unquestionably fall either to Japan or to some European Power; and, unless that Power happened to be England, the status and influence of British subjects on the Pacific coast of Asia would be relatively weakened. On this very account, it is patent that Germany, France and Russia, and, doubtless, also, Japan, would hail Judge Parker's success at the ballot-box, because he is known to be committed to a speedy concession of absolute independence to the Filipinos. To foreign onlookers it is plain that, if the American people should sanction Judge Parker's policy of "scuttle," a scramble on the part of at least five claimants for the possession of the Philippines would immediately follow.

It is likewise clear to Transatlantic observers that, if the promises to reduce expenditure set forth in the St. Louis platform, and in the published utterances of the Democratic nominee, could and should be carried out, the present drift of the United States toward the position of a great naval, if not also a great military, Power would be abruptly checked. If the Philippines were renounced, our regular army could be, and doubtless would be, cut down to one-half, or even one-third, of its actual size; and, while the war-ships already begun would probably be completed, no further expansion of our navy would be countenanced. We should cease, thereafter, to figure as a factor of prime importance in international warfare and diplomacy. We should tend to resume our former attitude of contented isolation and of indifference to the affairs of the outside world.

So far as Germany is concerned, her statesmen are mainly interested in the results of our Presidential elections by reason of their bearing on the perpetuation of the existing friendly understanding between the United States and England. Neither a Democratic nor a Republican President would tolerate the aggrandizement of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Germany at the expense of a Latin-American republic. The only difference would lie in the comparative readiness and ability of a Republican Administration to enforce a prohibitory fiat. From their specific point of view, the advocates of the transmarine expansion of the German Empire can see but little to choose between Mr. Roosevelt and Judge Parker, though they would naturally prefer to witness the triumph of a party which, if faithful to its professions, would try to reduce the appropriations for our army and navy. There is no doubt that, in the eyes of the German Colonial party, the United States constitutes the one formidable obstacle to the fulfilment of their schemes for the creation of dependencies on this side of the Atlantic. They cannot forget that a large part of Brazil was once for several decades possessed by a Teutonic Power, the States-General of the Low Countries; and they are haunted by the consciousness that at this hour a large and growing colony of Germans exists in the most southerly province of Brazil, namely, Rio Grande do Sul. These German colonists have their own churches, schools and newspapers, and evince no inclination to fuse with the neighboring Portuguese-speaking population. There is no doubt that they would gladly transfer their allegiance from the Brazilian Republic to the German Empire. With the German navy at their back, they could easily bring about the change. It is only the Monroe Doctrine that bars the way.

The earth-hunger excited in Germany by the knowledge that her language is spoken extensively in a flourishing province of Brazil is felt still more keenly by Italians, when they look at Argentina. So great and continuous has been the outflow of emigrants from Italy to the Argentine Republic, that the number of Italian-speaking residents in that commonwealth will soon, if it does not now, exceed the number of the descendants of the Spanish conquerors. If the emigration goes on—and there is no reason to suppose that it will cease—the Italian element seems destined to preponderate so largely in the Argentine population as to assure to it the ultimate control of the Buenos Ayres Government. In that event, the Italian Monarchy might be tempted to encourage a movement for the annexation of Argentina to the Peninsula Kingdom, or, at all events, for the adoption of monarchical institutions. It will be remembered that the Church party in Mexico was instigated by Napoleon III. to repudiate the republican régime, and to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

proclaim their country an empire. Of course, no second experiment of the kind would be risked, so long as the United States was known to have power enough to compel submission to the "stand-off" policy embodied in the Monroe Doctrine. But suppose our navy and our army should dwindle to the proportions which they possessed in the initial years of Mr. Cleveland's first Administration. How, then, could we enforce our wishes?

There is, evidently, one point of view from which all European nations which are engaged in manufacturing for export would be likely to regard the election of Judge Parker as beneficial to themselves. They would exaggerate the effect of the transfer of the powers of our Federal Executive to Democratic hands. Few statesmen on the Continent, and not a great many even in England, are familiar with the text of our Constitution and with the details of our political situation. It is hard for foreigners to comprehend that, even if Judge Parker were chosen President, and a Democratic majority should be returned to the House of Representatives, the ratification of reciprocity treaties between European countries and the United States would still be far distant. They cannot be made to understand that the confirmation of a reciprocity treaty would require the votes of two-thirds of the United States Senate, and that the present generation is unlikely to see the time when the high protectionists, who are firmly opposed to reciprocal tariff concessions, will not constitute more than a third of the Upper House of our Federal Legislature. It is really a matter of little practical consequence to foreign manufacturers whether a majority of the Presidential electors is secured on November 8th by Judge Parker, who favors reciprocity, or by Mr. Roosevelt, who declines to promise it.

There is one reciprocity treaty, indeed, that would have at least a chance of being negotiated and ratified, should the Democrats recover power. So many Republicans in several important States are such ardent advocates of reciprocity with Canada, that an agreement to that end might, conceivably, rally to cooperation with the Democrats a sufficient number of Republican Senators to assure confirmation. In the Dominion, however, there is much less desire for reciprocity than there was six years ago. At present, Canadian manufacturers seem determined to protect themselves against both British and American competitors. The Canadian general election, which will take place just before our own, will

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

show whether the agricultural or the manufacturing interest is likely to preponderate at Ottawa for some time to come. It is certain that the Maritime Provinces and the grain-producers of the Canadian Northwest would like, by means of a reciprocity treaty, to lower the tariff wall between themselves and the United States, and for that reason they would see with satisfaction the triumph of Judge Parker at the ballot-box. The manufacturers of Ontario would take a different view of the matter. One of the British colonies the inhabitants of which would vote to a man for reciprocity, is Newfoundland; it is, consequently, a well-wisher of the Democratic nominee. No doubt Jamaica, Trinidad and other sugar-producing islands in the British West Indies would also like to enter into reciprocal arrangements with us; but, unfortunately for them, our reciprocity treaty with Cuba contains a stipulation binding us not to enter into a similar convention with any sugar-growing country.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS NUMBER.

W. A. Dunning
is a graduate of Columbia University, in which institution he has occupied the chair of History for a number of years. Since 1894, he has been managing editor of the "Political Science Quarterly." He is a member of several learned societies, and is on the Executive Council of the American Historical Association. Professor Dunning is a frequent contributor to a variety of magazines, and has published volumes entitled "Essays on the Civil War and the Reconstruction," and "History of Political Theories."

Mr. Howells
has been travelling in England for the past nine months, renewing his impressions of English life and character, and of the social and intellectual atmosphere in which our transatlantic cousins pursue their varied activities. His contribution to this number on "English Feeling toward Americans" embodies reflections and speculations on that subject which have been suggested by his recent observations among what he calls our "contemporary ancestors."

William Garrott Brown
is a native of Alabama. He completed his course in Howard College in 1886, after which he was Instructor in the Marion Military Institute for two years. He entered Harvard University in 1889, and graduated in 1891, with the highest honors in History. From 1892 to 1900, he was Assistant Librarian in Harvard, and Lecturer on American History in 1901-2. Meanwhile, he took an active part in politics, stumping Massachusetts for Cleveland in 1892 and serving on various Democratic committees for several years. He is the author of a number of books, including "A History of Alabama," "Andrew Jackson," "Stephen Arnold Douglas,"

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"The Lower South in American History," "Selden: a Memory of the Black Belt," and "Gentleman of the South."

VERNON LEE

is the pen-name of Miss Violet Paget, an English writer and critic who has lived for a number of years in Italy. She has written much on the history of the arts, literature and drama of Italy. Among her published works are "Studies of the Eighteenth Century in Italy," "Belcaro" (essays), "Ottilie," "Euphorion" (essays on Renaissance), "Miss Brown," "Baldwin" (philosophical dialogues), "Juvenilia" (essays), "Althea," and "Renaissance Fancies and Studies." Readers of the REVIEW will recall with pleasure two brilliant papers recently contributed to its pages by Miss Paget's gifted pen—one on "The Economic Dependence of Women," and the other entitled "A Postscript on Ruskin."

JUAN SUMULONG

was born in Antipolo, Rizal, in 1870. At one time he was engaged in the profession of journalism in the capacity of manager of a paper called "*La Democracia,*" the organ of the Federal Party, to the directory of which party he still belongs. He is a member of the Bar Association of Manila, in which city he practises law. He is also a Professor in the Manila Law School. He is one of the Filipino Commissioners to the St. Louis Exposition. The article as printed has been approved by Sr. Sumulong as a faithful translation of his original Spanish.

LAWRENCE GILMAN,

who was born in Flushing, New York, studied musical theory and composition with the idea of preparing himself for the field of musical criticism. He has for some years contributed to the magazines and musical journals, and at present occupies the position of music critic for a prominent New York periodical.

MARK SULLIVAN

was born in Chester County, Pennsylvania. He is a graduate of Harvard College and of the Harvard Law School. While yet a student, he contributed much to the "Boston Transcript," "The Outlook," "The Atlantic Monthly," and other magazines. After taking his degree from the Law School he was for a time an associate-editor of the "Boston Transcript." He is now practising law in New York city.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CARLYON BELLAIRS

is a lecturer and writer on questions of international trade and maritime warfare. He has endeavored to study closely the economical strength of nations as the root of their military power, and to develop a school of thought which looks beyond the influence of sea-power upon nations to the influence of commerce upon sea-power. He is a lecturer at the War Course of the Royal Naval College, which is the British equivalent of the War College at Newport. He assisted in editing the "Naval Annual" in 1903 and 1904, and has contributed to the "Encyclopædia Britannica" and many other publications. He was the only naval officer examined before the British Government's inquiry into the routes of submarine cables, and strenuously but unsuccessfully supported, on strategical, political, and commercial grounds, the route *viâ* Honolulu for the British Pacific cable, so as to link it with the American cables which have since been laid. The last contribution from Mr. Carlyon Bellairs in this REVIEW was in August, 1900, on the "Crisis in China."

FIONA MACLEOD

published her first book in 1894, and since then there has been much speculation as to her personality, which has resulted in a number of myths, more or less amusing and absurd. The changing rumor went that she was William Sharp, that she was Mrs. Sharp, that she was the daughter of the late Dr. Norman Macleod, that she was Nora Hopper and W. B. Yeats in unison, that she was a syndicate of young Celtic authors, that she was a Fleet Street journalist, that she was Irish and that her real name was Charles O'Connor, and even that she was Maud Gonne. Miss Macleod comes of an old, Highland, Catholic family of that name. She was born in the Southern Hebrides, and much of her childhood was passed in the Outer Hebrides, in the Inner Hebrides and the West Highlands of Scotland. The island of Innisron in her first romance, "Pharais," is believed to be a remote island where in childhood she spent many summers. So, too, certain incidents in the portraiture of the heroine Lora occurring in the same romance are, to some extent, founded upon her own personal experience. During the past eight years, Miss Macleod has wielded a busy pen. In addition to the romance already mentioned, she has published,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

among others, the following works: "The Mountain Lovers," "The Sin-Eater," "The Washer of the Ford," "Green Fire," "From the Hills of Dream," "The Dominion of Dreams," "The Divine Adventure," "The Immortal Hour," "Trostan and Yseul."

FINLANDER

is a Finnish patriot and a high authority upon Finland from the national point of view. He was formerly a prominent member of the Finnish Senate and he now resides in Stockholm.

NOTE.

The article on "Sir William Harcourt," by Mr. George W. E. Russell, which was published in the November number, was written a considerable time before Sir William Harcourt's death.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED